R. Grosteste-des-Mahis (Mr.)

THE TRUTH

OF THE

CATHOLIC RELIGION

PROVED FROM THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

R. Grosteste-des-Mahis (Mr.)

By Mr. DES MAHIS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH.

NEWCASTLE:

PRINTED BY EDWARD WALKER.

1799.

BRITISH MUSEUM

42.
3. 7.
19.

PREFACE.

THE following work was originally written in French by the celebrated Mr. Des Mahis, who after having officiated for ſeveral years as miniſter to the Calviniſts of Orleans, embraced the Catholic faith, and was ſoon after advanced to the order of prieſthood. In this new ſtation he conſecrated all his time and talents to the ſervice of God, and the edification of his neighbour, and by his ſermons and writings, induced numbers to abjure their errors, and reconcile themſelves to the Church. Senſible of the averſion, with which Proteſtants liſten to the voice of authority, and willing to accommodate himſelf even to their prejudices, he undertook, in the following treatiſe, to prove the truth of the Catholic doctrine from the Scriptures alone. In it he fully demonſtrates, that the tenets of Catholics controverted by Proteſtants, are clearly delivered in holy writ; that the arguments adduced againſt them originate either in ignorance or prejudice; that the paſſages of Scripture, which they are ſaid to contradict, are either corruptly tranſlated, or falſely interpreted; in a word, that even thoſe, who admit no other rule of faith than Scripture, muſt yet, if they will be conſiſtent with themſelves, admit the doctrines in queſtion.

It is not indeed preſumed, that of the paſſages of Scripture quoted in the following pages, there are none, which may not, by an ingenious diſputant, be tortured and wreſted to a different ſignification. But the impartial reader ſhould reflect, that ſuch interpretations are ſuſpicious: they are the offspring of neceſſity, and only invented to ſupport a cauſe, which muſt fall without them. But the interpretations given in this work are not of modern diſcovery: they are as ancient as Chriſtianity; they are to be found in the writings of the fathers, who lived many centuries ago; and in whoſe time the truth of theſe doctrines had never been called in queſtion.

That the knowledge of the truths revealed by God is the moſt important, and moſt neceſſary of all ſciences, muſt be univerſally admitted. For "without faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God, * and "he that believeth not, ſhall be condemned." † God is the ſovereign Lord, and ſupreme lawgiver; it is his will that he be known and ſerved by all men. "Better is a child, that is poor and knows this, "than a king, who knoweth not to foreſee for hereafter." ‡ Now this knowledge ſo indiſpenſably neceſſary, is to be learned from the word of God, and his Church, which he has appointed to be the interpreter of it: not from the word of God alone, as interpreted by private perſons, for "no prophecy of Scripture is made by private "interpretation: it contains things hard to be underſtood, which "the unlearned and unſtable wreſt to their own deſtruction:" § but from the word of God interpreted by the Church, "which is the "pillar and ground of the truth, ‖ and with which he will remain all "days to the conſummation of the world." ¶

Even if our bleſſed Saviour had not commanded us to follow this guide in the purſuit of truth, yet we ſhould not have been able to diſcover a more ſatisfactory means of ſilencing religious diſputes, and deciding controverſies, than the authority of the Catholic Church. No authority on earth can be equal to hers. She is not a Church, that dates her origin two centuries ago, but has exiſted ever ſince the days of the Apoſtles; ſhe is not a Church confined within the limits of a ſingle kingdom, or a few provinces, but has been extended through all the nations of the univerſe: ſhe has numbered in every age thouſands among her children, eminent for the extent of their knowledge and the ſanctity of their lives: her deciſions with reſpect to the tenets diſputed by Proteſtants, (if we except the Pope's ſupremacy, which is naturally denied by all, who ſeparate from his communion,) are ſupported by the belief of all other Chriſtians in the world, Greeks, Ruſſians, Armenians, Jacobites, Cophts, Neſtorians, &c. They were believed by the firſt Chriſtians among the Britons in this Iſland, and by the whole nation from the converſion of the

---

* Heb xi. 6. † Mark xvi. 16. ‡ Eccl. iv. 13.
§ 2 Pet. i. 20. iii. 16. ‖ 1 Tim. iii. 15. ¶ Matt. xxviii. 20.

Saxons by S. Auguſtin and his fellow labourers, during the long lapſe of above ſeven hundred years; all our ancient monuments, Acts of Parliament, Churches, Rituals, Hiſtories, depoſe in their favour. Certainly the conſentient voice of ſo many Chriſtians, in all ages, ought to ſtagger the confidence of thoſe, who, on the authority of their own private judgment, preſume to reject the doctrines which ſhe teaches.

But God has not left us to our own private judgment, even in this point: for though ſubmiſſion to the authority of the Church be ſo conſonant to reaſon, yet he has repeatedly enforced and commanded it in holy writ. There is not perhaps any article on which he has been more clear and explicit. All muſt hear the Church. "If he "will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and "the publican." *

It ſhould be a moſt conſoling thought to Catholics, that they "are no more children toſſed to and fro, and carried away with every "wind of doctrine." † Their faith is irrevocably fixed: they are under the guidance of a Church, "againſt which the gates of "Hell will never prevail." ‡ Let it be then their care to live up to the faith, which they profeſs, and by their conduct let them ſhew their gratitude to their Maker for ſo ineſtimable a bleſſing.

---

* Matt. xviii. 17. See chap. ix. of the work.
† Eph. iv. 14. ‡ Matt. xvi. 18.

APPROBATIONS.

When this work was firſt publiſhed in 1697, it was honored with the printed Approbations of the celebrated Fenelon, Archbiſhop of Cambray; of Boſſuet, Biſhop of Meaux; of the Biſhops of Belley, Soiſſons, Chartres, Glandeves, and Chaalons, and of the Univerſity of Paris. It has been thought proper to ſubjoin ſome of their Approbations.

Approbation of the Moſt Rev. the Archbiſhop, Duke of Cambray.

I Was formerly employed with the author of the work entitled, *The Truth of the Catholic Religion, &c.* in the inſtruction of our Proteſtant Brethren. I ſhall never forget, what I was then witneſs to, the ſweetneſs, patience, prudence, and modeſty, with which he diſplayed his abilities on that occaſion. He had learned from experience how great and arduous is the taſk of abjuring one's errors, and was therefore exceedingly tender to others, in bearing with their infirmities in that regard. I am very happy to find in his work the ſame marks of edification, which I met with in the conduct of his life. His writings beſpeak a man who is entirely taken up in procuring the ſalvation of his brethren; who is ready to meet every difficulty, and to let ſlip no opportunity of rectifying the prejudices of his neighbour. He was ſo well acquainted with the doctrine of Proteſtants, that he might be taken for one of their moſt enlightened Miniſters; and he diſtinguiſhed the dogmas of the Catholic Church with as much preciſion, as if he had been educated in them from his infancy. I flatter myſelf that a work, which was undertaken with the pureſt intentions will prove a ſource of benediction to thoſe, who have the candour to read it with the ſame diſpoſition, with which it was written. Given at Cambray the 15th of Dec. 1695.

† FRA. ARCH. DUKE of CAMBRAY.

Approbation of the Rt. Rev. the Biſhop of Meaux.

We have ſeen the work entitled, *The Truth, &c.* and judge it worthy the piety and learning of its author, whoſe life was a model for Miniſters that embrace the true faith; whoſe knowledge was a guide to thoſe that had loſt their way; and whoſe memory, not unlike perfumes, diffuſes a ſweet odour over the whole Church. We recommend the peruſal of this work to the faithful, who will find in

it a true ſtatement of the doctrine of the Catholic, Apoſtolic, and Roman Church; together with the objections of Proteſtants refuted by arguments drawn from the word of God. This is the teſtimony we bear to the truth. Given at Germigny, the 4th of Nov. 1695.

† BENIGN BISHOP of MEAUX.

Approbation of the Doctors of Sorbonne.

The worthy author of the book entitled, *The Truth of the Catholic Religion, &c.* becoming ſenſible of the injuſtice of the ſchiſm, in which he had the misfortune to be born, made a ready ſacrifice of his heart and mind, to embrace the truth and religion of his forefathers. His zeal for the cauſe of truth, and the ſalvation of his fellow-creatures, prompted him to explain, in the moſt ſolid manner, the faith of the Church, as founded on the irrefragable authority of the word of God. He diſcuſſes the moſt difficult points of controverſy with a ſurpriſing clearneſs; and his propoſitions are grounded upon the moſt ſolid proofs. We are convinced that nobody can read this work, without prejudice, but muſt be ſatisfied, that whatever is here treated of, carries with it the fulleſt evidence, and is capable of undeceiving all thoſe, who have their ſalvation at heart, and are in earneſt in their enquiries after truth: hence we are in great hopes that it will prove of conſiderable advantage in the converſion of thoſe that err, and in the inſtruction of the faithful. Done at Paris the 13th of January, 1696.

L. Le Carron, Curate of S. Peter's.

Ad. Francelles, P. D. of the ſociety of Sorbonne, Curate of S. John's.

Leonard Chapelas, curate of S. Germain's,

Ph. De la Coste.

J. Gilbert.

TABLE of CHAPTERS.

PART I.

Of the Church.

CHAP. PAGE.

I. OF the equivocal marks of the Church 1

II. Of the principal marks of the Church, and firſt of its unity 10

III. Of the holineſs of the Church 17

IV. Of the Catholicity of the Church 20

V. Of the fourth mark of the Church, which is its title of Apoſtolic 24

VI. A continuation of the ſame ſubject, in which it is ſhewn, that the ſeparation of the firſt Reformers from the Church, evinces clearly, that their ſociety is not the Church of Jeſus Chriſt 26

VII. Of the Firſt Reformers 38

VIII. Of the ſucceſſion of paſtors in particular Churches . . . 45

IX. Of the privilege granted to the Church, of never falling into error 50

X. Continuation of the ſame ſubject, in which the principal objections are anſwered from the Holy Scriptures . . 78

XI. Of the viſibility of the Church 93

XII. Of the word of God 97

XIII. Of Traditions 110

XIV. Of Councils 118

XV. Of the Pope 130

PART II.

Of the Euchariſt.

I. Of the real preſence of the body of our Lord in the Euchariſt 145

II. Proofs taken from the Sixth Chapter of St. John . . . 146

CHAP. PAGE.

III. On the words of the Inſtitution 176
IV. Containing ſeveral other arguments drawn from the words of the inſtitution, to prove the real preſence of the body of Jeſus Chriſt in the bleſſed Euchariſt 186
V. In which is ſhewn the doctrine of St. Paul on this ſubject 192
VI. Which contains the anſwer to the principal objections, which Proteſtants bring againſt the arguments deduced from the words of the Inſtitution 196
VII. In which thoſe difficulties are removed, which are raiſed from paſſages of the Holy Scripture, that have no relation to the Euchariſt 214
VIII. Of Tranſubſtantiation 225
IX. Of the adoration of Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt 234
X. Of the ſacrifice of the Maſs 239
XI. Of the uſe of the Cup 252

PART III.

Of the Sacraments.

I. Of Baptiſm 277
II. Of Confirmation 281
III. Of Penance 286
IV. Of Extreme Unction 293
V. Of Order 296
VI. Of Matrimony 299
VII. Of the Ceremonies of the Church 307
VIII. Of Images 316
IX. Of the Language of the Service 327
X. Of Feſtivals 336
XI. Of Prayers addreſſed to the Angels and Saints 340
XII. Of Relics 366
XIII. Of Purgatory and Prayer for the Dead 368
XIV. Of Juſtification 382
XV. General Concluſion 394

THE TRUTH

OF THE

CATHOLIC RELIGION

PROVED FROM THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

The word of God is living and effectual, and more piercing than any two edged sword.

St. Paul. Heb. iv. 12.

FIRST PART.

THE TRUTH

OF THE

CATHOLIC RELIGION

PROVED FROM THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

The word of God is living and powerful, and more piercing
than any two edged sword.

St. Paul. Heb. iv. 12.

FIRST PART.

THE TRUTH
OF THE
CATHOLIC RELIGION
PROVED FROM THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

PART I.

Of the CHURCH.

CHAP. I.

Of the equivocal marks of the Church.

Q. WHAT muſt we do, in order to form a right notion of the Church?

A. We muſt be attentive to the principal marks, by which it is characterized in the Holy Scriptures, and be upon our guard againſt thoſe marks, which are repreſented by the ſame Holy Scriptures as equivocal, and which are to be found ſometimes on the ſide of truth, and ſometimes on that of error.

Q. Which are the principal of thoſe marks, which the Holy Scriptures direct us to conſider as only equivocal?

A. They direct us to conſider in this light, proſperity; adverſity; the prediction of ſome events, which are in the courſe of providence; the performance of ſome actions, which have the appearance of miracles; the learning, zeal, and reputation of ſome teachers; the uſe of temporal puniſhments; the conſtancy, with which

ſome ſuffer perſecution, and even death, for their religion; the candor, zeal, almſdeeds, and other good works of individuals; and laſtly, the common pretence of all ſects, that their faith is grounded on the word of God. All theſe marks, according to the Holy Scriptures, are only equivocal, and are ſometimes to be met with on the ſide of error, and ſometimes on the ſide of truth; whence it is clear, that no judgment can be formed from them, by which one may diſcover the true Church.

Q. Why have you placed proſperity and adverſity among the equivocal marks of the Church? *

A. With regard to the Church of Iſrael, we ſee in the Old Teſtament, that ſometimes ſhe ſubdued her enemies, and at other times was ſubdued by them; and as to the Chriſtian Church, the Holy Ghoſt foretels in ſome paſſages, that ſhe ſhall be perſecuted; that ſhe ſhall flee into the wilderneſs; † that her children ſhall be put to death, &c. ‡ and in others, that Chriſtians ſhall reign on the earth; § that the kingdoms of the world ſhall be ſubject to Jeſus Chriſt; and that kings ſhall be the nurſing fathers of the Church, and queens its nurſes. ‖ Proſperity then is not a certain mark of the Church, ſince the Holy Spirit often ſhews it to us in the greateſt affliction. Nor are afflictions a certain mark, ſince the Holy Spirit foretels, that it ſhall often enjoy the greateſt proſperity.

Q. Since Proteſtants often urge their afflictions and proſperity as motives to perſuade themſelves, that they are the true Church, add ſomething more on this ſubject.

A. They ought to learn from the word of God, that nothing is more equivocal than afflictions. If they are frequently proofs of the paternal goodneſs of God, who

---

* Jo. xvi. 33. † Apoc. xii. 6. ‡ Apoc. vi. 9. xi. 7.
§ Apoc. v. 10. ‖ Iſai. xlix. 23. liv. 11 12.

deſigns by them to purify his Church, they are likewiſe often the effects of his juſtice, in puniſhing his enemies.* Such were the afflictions of the idolatrous Jews under the government of pious kings, while at the ſame time the adorers of the true God enjoyed the greateſt proſperity. Such were the afflictions of the ten Tribes,† when God puniſhed them for their ſchiſms by the captivity, into which they were led by Salmanaſſar. Such in the New Teſtament are the plagues mentioned in the Apocalypſe,‡ by which God puniſhes the adorers of the beaſt and other enemies of the Church.

Q. Speak now of proſperity.

A. I ſay, that Proteſtants are not leſs deceived, when they conſider ſome ſucceſs of their ſociety as an argument in their favor. They ought to learn from the Holy Scriptures, that ſuch proſperity often attends ſocieties, that are enemies of the true Church. The ambitious Jeroboam undertook to ſeparate ten Tribes from the family of David, and to alienate them from the worſhip in the Temple; and effected it without the loſs of a ſingle man. Jeroboam eſtabliſhed a kingdom more powerful than that of Roboam, who was abandoned by the greateſt part of his people; and God gave ſuch ſtrength to the new-erected throne of this uſurper, as to order Roboam to be told,§ that all efforts to deprive him of it would prove ineffectual. Yet notwithſtanding this ſurpriſing ſucceſs, Jeroboam was an ambitious man, who made the plauſible reaſons of policy and Religion ſubſervient to his private views;‖ he was at the bottom an enemy of Religion, and together with all his party was involved in a damnable Schiſm. How often afterwards did this rebellious party triumph over Juda, the inhabitants of which compoſed the true Church? Joas, a ſucceſſor of Jeroboam, made Amaſias, king of Juda,

---

* 2 Kings xiii. 5, 20. † 2 Kings xvii. 25. ‡ Apoc. ix. xvi.
§ 1 Kings xii. 24. ‖ 1 Kings xii. 27. 33.

priſoner, and demoliſhed the greateſt part of the walls of Jeruſalem; * and another of theſe ſchiſmatical kings, at the head of the ten Tribes, took two hundred thouſand of the people of God priſoners. The holy Scriptures then evidently ſhew, that victories and other advantages of this nature, are only equivocal proofs, and may be allied with error.

Q. Why do you reckon the predictions of ſome particular events, that have happened according to the ordinary courſe of Providence, among the equivocal marks of the Church?

A. We ſee in holy writ, that ſome men have maintained evident falſities by foretelling events, that have fallen out conformably to their predictions. † *If*, ſays Moſes, *there riſe in the midſt of thee a Prophet, and that come to paſs, which he ſpoke, and he ſay to thee: Let us go and follow ſtrange gods, thou ſhalt not hear the words of that prophet.* There is no room to doubt, but that the prophets of Baal, who kept up the ſpirit of idolatry among the Jews, foretold that they ſhould ſoon be delivered from the afflictions, which idolatry drew upon them under the government of faithful princes, and that they aſſumed a falſe pride, when afterwards they ſaw (what frequently happened) either an idolatrous king ſucceed to the throne, or pious and faithful princes at laſt fall into idolatry. ‡ We ſee likewiſe among the Samaritan Schiſmatics ſeveral prophets, who called themſelves the prophets of God. It would have been ſtrange if, out of a number of their predictions, not ſo much as one had ever been fulfilled. Our Saviour alſo in the New Teſtament, § took notice of ſeveral lying prophets, who would tell the Jews, that they were ſent by God for their deliverance; and Saint John, ſpeaking of the heretical ſocieties of his time, ſaid, that many falſe prophets were gone out into the world. ‖

---

* 2 Chron. xxv. 23. † Deut. xiii. 4. ‡ 2 Chron. xxiv. 17. 18.
§ Mat. xxiv. 11. ‖ 1 John iv. 1.

Q. Why do you put certain miraculous deeds, that have an appearance of being true miracles, among the equivocal marks of the Church?

A. The Holy Scriptures mention ſome, which it is manifeſt muſt have been from the devil. Thus Pharaoh's Magicians performed ſeveral prodigies. *Behold, I am againſt the prophets*, ſaid the Lord by the mouth of Jeremy, *that cauſe my people to err by their lying and by their wonders.** And in the New Teſtament, we ſee lying prophets, who, that they may gain credit to their pretended Meſſiahs, work many falſe miracles.† We ſee one who, to induce men to adore the beaſt, does great ſigns in his ſight, and even makes fire come down from heaven.‡ We find there likewiſe the hiſtory of Simon the Magician, who, as it is expreſſed in Scripture, ſo beguiled men by his ſorceries, that they called him the *great power of God.* §

Q. Why do you place men, that are learned, eloquent, zealous, and much followed, among the equivocal marks of the Church?

A. Becauſe we ſee ſuch in the Holy Scriptures eſpouſing the cauſe of error. Such were the Scribes and Doctors of the law, who would not hear our Saviour,‖ among whom is reckoned the learned Gamaliel, who was St. Paul's maſter.¶ Such were the Phariſees, who went round ſea and land to make one proſelyte.** Such was the eloquent Tertullus, who was appointed by the Jews to plead againſt St. Paul.†† Such were the learned Athenians, who ridiculed that Apoſtle.‡‡ Such were the Heretics, whom the Apoſtles condemned, who boaſted of their knowledge and penetration into the profoundeſt myſteries.§§ It is for

---

* Jerem. xxiii. 32. † Marc xiii. 22.
‡ Apoc. xiii. 13. 2 Theſ. ii. 9. § Acts viii. 10. 11.
‖ Mat. xxiii. 15. ¶ Acts xxii. 3. ** Mat. xxiii. 15.
†† Acts xxiv. 1. 2. ‡‡ Acts xxvii. 32. §§ 1 Tim. vi. 20.

this reaſon, that St. Paul ſays, *let no man deceive you by loftineſs of words. Beware leſt any man impoſe upon you by philoſophy and vain deceit, according to the rudiments of the world.* * With regard to the ſucceſs, that may attend ſome Doctors, we ſee that in Samaria, where Jeſus Chriſt himſelf had carried the light of his doctrine, the ſeducer Simon was followed by all the inhabitants from the leaſt to the greateſt. † It is for this reaſon that whatever idea the Proteſtants may frame to themſelves of the perſonal qualifications and ſucceſs of their reformers, they ought ſtill to learn from the Holy Scriptures, that ſuch marks are only equivocal, and not to be depended upon.

Q. Why do you look upon the uſe of temporal puniſhments in religious caſes, as ſomething equivocal?

A. Proteſtants ought to learn from the Holy Scriptures, not to pronounce, as many of them do, that the Catholic Church cannot be the true Church, becauſe in it recourſe has been had to temporal puniſhments. If a ſociety, in which thoſe, on whom God has beſtowed the civil power, make uſe of it in favor of their religion, cannot be the true Church, the Church of Iſrael would not have been ſuch, neither in the time of Moſes, who made ſeveral laws againſt idolaters, nor in the times of the moſt pious kings of the Old Teſtament, who in that reſpect followed the example of Moſes, nor in the time of Daniel, who did not prevent Nabuchodonoſor from making a decree, that whoever ſhould blaſpheme againſt God, ſhould be deſtroyed, and his houſe laid waſte. ‡ The Chriſtian Church would not have been the true Church, even in the time of the Apoſtles, who did not only make uſe of the moſt preſſing motives to convince, but ſometimes employed corporal puniſhments, as in the caſe of Ananias and Saphira, and in that of the inceſtuous Corinthian. God himſelf would not be

---

* Col. 11. 4. 8. † Acts viii. 10. ‡ Dan. iii. 96.

blameleſs, ſince he chaſtiſes men to make them open their eyes to the light. Parents would not be blameleſs, ſince they correct their children to make them quit their diſorders. For Princes, who are the fathers of the people, * are not more reprehenſible, when they exert their power to correct their ſubjects, than parents, when they do the ſame with regard to their children. Theſe remarks are taken from the Holy Scriptures, and muſt convince us, that we cannot conclude that a ſociety is not the true Church, becauſe the Princes that reign in it, make uſe of their authority, to bring men to the faith. Such uſe of power, is only a mark, that is to be found in erroneous Churches, as well as in the true one. Proteſtants have formerly inflicted theſe puniſhments with ſeverity to ſupport their ſect, and have employed it to hinder the Catholics from freely exerciſing their Religion in moſt countries, where the reformed Religion prevails.

Q. Why do you call conſtancy in afflictions, and death undergone for Religion, only equivocal marks?

A. We read in the word of God, that ſeveral enemies of truth have not only ſuffered, but even died in ſupport of the errors, which they had embraced. The four hundred prophets of Baal, who were put to death by order of Elias, † for their adheſion to idolatry, are proofs of this; as are ſo many others, whom the pious king Joſias ſlew for the ſame reaſon. ‡

Q. Why do you rank candor, zeal, almſdeeds, and other good works among equivocal marks of the church?

A. The Holy Scriptures have likewiſe warned us on this ſubject, that Satan often transforms himſelf into an angel of light; and that ravening wolves ſometimes come in the clothing of ſheep. § Many good works

---

* Iſai. xlix. 23. † 1 Kings xviii. 40. ‡ 2 Kings xxiii. 5. 20.
§ 2. Cor. xi. 14. Mat. vii. 15.

were performed in the party of the ten ſchiſmatical tribes: Thus they even releaſed two hundred thouſand captives of the two tribes, that remained faithful to God, and furniſhed them according to their neceſſities with waggons, clothes, and proviſions. * Our Saviour likewiſe repreſents greater charity among the Samaritans than among the Jews. † No man can have more ſincerity or zeal than the Jews had, of whom St Paul gives teſtimony, that they had the zeal of God, though that zeal was not according to knowledge; ‡ nor than thoſe, who had bound themſelves by oath not to eat, till they had killed St. Paul; nor than thoſe who actually put the Apoſtles to death, of whom our Lord ſaid, § that they would think they did a ſervice to God; nor than thoſe who crucified our Lord, of whom St. Paul obſerves, that if they had known the king of glory, they never would have nailed him to a croſs; ‖ or than St. Paul himſelf before his converſion. It is manifeſt that there was a great deal of ſincerity, zeal, almſdeeds, and other good works among this party of the Jews. They had not a more plauſible reaſon to flatter themſelves that they were the people of God. But ſo far were they from it, that they were his greateſt enemies. All theſe ſigns then are nothing more than equivocal marks of the true Church.

Q. Why do you call the pretence of being grounded on the word of God, an equivocal mark of the church?

A. The Holy Scriptures teach us, that this pretence is found out of the true Church. The Samaritans endeavoured to prove the holineſs of their mountain from thoſe paſſages of the five books of Moſes, in which it appears, that the ancient Patriarchs offered their ſacrifices on it, and that God had ſhewn by the miraculous favours, he had beſtowed there, how agree-

---

* 2. Chron. xxviii. 15. † Luc. x. 33. xvii. 11.
‡ Rom. x. 2. Act. xxiii. 21. § Jo. xvi. 2. ‖ 1. Cor. ii. 8. Phil. iii. 6.

able ſuch adoration was to him. *Our fathers*, ſays the Samaritan woman, *adored on this mountain.* * The Sadducees likewiſe undertook to ſhew from a citation out of Moſes, that the dead would not riſe again. † We may ſay in general, that all the Jews who refuſed to embrace Chriſtianity, grounded their refuſal upon the Scriptures. St. John relates, that they attempted to prove to our Lord from the word of God, *that Chriſt could not die*: ‡ and St. Paul ſays, *that when they read Moſes, the veil is upon their hearts.* § And there were ſeveral among the firſt Chriſtians, who ſupported the moſt pernicious errors by allegations from the epiſtles of St. Paul. It is for this reaſon St. Peter ſays, that they wreſted them, as they did alſo other parts of the ſcriptures, to their own deſtruction, by taking them in a wrong ſenſe. ‖ The devil himſelf, the author of all the illuſions that I have mentioned, quoted the ſcripture, when he attacked our Lord with his temptations in the deſert. ¶ For which reaſon this pretext of being founded on the word of God, is at beſt equivocal, and thoſe, who love their ſouls, will be deſirous of diſcovering ſome other light, by which they may more certainly diſtinguiſh the Church of Jeſus Chriſt.

Q. Do you mean to inculcate by what you have ſaid, that the Doctors of the true Church can never lay any ſtreſs on theſe different marks, that you have mentioned?

A. They have a right to exhibit them in favor of the true Church, not only becauſe they may be ſeen there in a more eminent degree than in erroneous ſocieties; but likewiſe becauſe having firſt ſhewn by certain marks, that the Church, in which they teach, is the true one, they have by that means acquired a legitimate right of applying to it, theſe weaker proofs, when they may

---

* Jo. iv. 20. † Matt. xxii. 24. ‡ Jo. xii. 34.
§ 2. Cor. iii. 14. 15. ‖ 2. Pet. iii. 16. ¶ Mat. iv. 6.

conduce to the edification of their hearers: for many are more affected by conſiderations of this kind, than by more ſolid arguments. The defect of Proteſtants in this regard is, that they are always ſtriving to adduce theſe equivocal marks in favor of their opinions, without ever being able to prove, by the principal, true and certain marks, that theirs is the Church of Jeſus Chriſt.

CHAP. II.

Of the principal marks of the Church, and firſt of its unity.

Q. Which are the principal marks, by which the Church is diſtinguiſhed in the Holy Scriptures?

A. They are, that it is *One, Holy, Catholic and Apoſtolic.*

Q. Quote ſome paſſages on the unity of the Church of Jeſus Chriſt?

A. *My ſheep*, ſays our Lord, *ſhall hear my voice, and there ſhall be but one fold and one ſhepherd.* * *There is but one body, and one ſpirit*, ſays St. Paul, *as you are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, and one baptiſm, one God and father of all.* †

Q. Does this mark of unity ſhew, that the Proteſtants are not the true Church?

A. They have not this unity: for they are divided into many ſects, which either reciprocally condemn the tenets of each other, or refuſe to receive the ſacrament of the Euchariſt from each others hands, or reject the ordinations of others as invalid. Thus the greateſt part of the Lutherans accuſe the Calviniſts of hereſy, and will not aſſociate with them: Thus the Proteſtants of the Church of England reordain thoſe of the French reformed party, who wiſh to engage in the miniſtry:

* John x. 16. † Eph. iv. 4. 6.

and neither will admit the Independants into their communion.

Q. It appears from the Holy Scriptures, that there were diviſions among the firſt Chriſtians. Might not then the Jews and Pagans have objected their diviſions to them, with as much reaſon as you object to Proteſtants the difference of opinion, which ſo much prevails among them?

A. No compariſon ſhould be made here: for the Apoſtolic Church never conſidered the ſects, that you have mentioned, as part of the Church, nor ever incorporated them with herſelf. But the Calviniſts of France, and the Lutherans, who reject the communion of the Calviniſts, and the Engliſh Proteſtants, who reordain their miniſters, are conſidered by each other as parts of the Church. A body ſo divided cannot be the Church of Jeſus Chriſt, which ought to be *one body and one flock*.

Q. Since the reformed Church does not conſider ſeveral modern ſects as parts of the Church, though they ſprung from her, may it not be ſaid, that they at leaſt no more deſtroy her unity, than the ancient ſectaries did that of the primitive Church?

A. No: for the diviſions of thoſe times did not originate from any principle of the Chriſtian Religion. So far from it, that their riſe was entirely owing to the raſhneſs and obſtinacy of ſome, who renounced the great principle of the firſt Chriſtians, which was ſubmiſſion to the authority of the Apoſtles, and after them to that of the Church, which they eſtabliſhed. The diviſions among the Proteſtants cannot be thus charged to heat or paſſion inſtigating ſome of them to relinquiſh the grand principle of their Religion. On the contrary the ſource of all the different ſects among them, has been an adheſion to that principle, which conſiſts in rejecting the authority of the Church, and deciding by their own private lights, whether it explains the Holy Scriptures in the true meaning.

Q. Are there not diviſions alſo in the Catholic Church?

A. Yes: but the diviſions of Proteſtants are incompatible with the unity of faith and unity of communion, mentioned by St. Paul in the paſſage quoted above. Thoſe of the Catholics are not ſo.

Q. Which is the firſt difference between the diviſions among the Proteſtants and thoſe among Catholics?

A. The word of God, which informs us that there is *but one faith*, compels us to conſider as eſſentially wrong all diviſions, which reſpect the truths, that are of faith. But the diſputes, that exiſt in the Catholic Church are not of this nature; becauſe the Catholics admit nothing to be an article of faith, but what is ſupported by the approbation of the whole body. But as Proteſtants have not any certain and fixed rule, by which they may know the truths of faith, they are divided from one another, not only about Theological queſtions, but about faith itſelf. Thus the Calviniſts, for inſtance, deny the real preſence of the body of Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt; whilſt the Lutherans, whom they eſteem as brethren, believe it.

Q. What other difference do you remark between the diviſions among Catholics, and thoſe that ſubſiſt among Proteſtants?

A. Since the word of God tells us in expreſs terms, (and the example of all the Saints confirms the ſame, as we ſhall ſee hereafter,) that it is never lawful to ſeparate from the body of the Church, we are compelled to conſider as eſſentially wrong the diviſions, which lead to that ſeparation. Such are the diviſions among Proteſtants; becauſe they believe that the whole viſible body of the Church may fall into fundamental errors, and conſequently believe it lawful to quit it, and form a ſeparate ſociety. This it is, that has ſo ſtrangely multiplied errors in England and in Holland. Now Catholics do not lead men to a ſeparation ſo clearly anathematiſed by the Holy Scriptures, becauſe they are all bound together by one common principle, which is, that there never can be a lawful pretext to ſeparate from the ancient body of the Church.

Q. May not one believe that the ancient body of the Church, and the other ſocieties that are ſeparated from it, are ſo many different parts, which collectively make up the one body of the univerſal Church?

A. The Holy Scriptures will not allow this. For the Apoſtles direct us in ſeveral places to avoid a Heretic, who after different admonitions continues obſtinate in his error, * and St. Paul in plain terms reckons hereſies and ſchiſms among the works of the fleſh, that ſhut the gates of heaven againſt the abettors of them: *The works of the fleſh*, ſays he, *are diſſenſions*, SECTS, *drunkenneſs, and ſuch like, of which I foretel you, as I have foretold to you, that they, who do ſuch things, ſhall not obtain the kingdom of God.* †

Q. Is not this condemnation of thoſe, who are not joined in union with the Church, a violation of the command of Jeſus Chriſt, *judge not, that you may not be judged?* ‡

A. This ſentence falls only on ſuch as judge of their neighbour's heart or intention; and accordingly the Catholic Church inceſſantly exclaims againſt raſh judgements. But this is no reaſon, why we may not condemn thoſe actions, which the Holy Ghoſt ſo manifeſtly reprobates, ſuch as adultery, murder, ſchiſm and hereſy, which as we have juſt ſeen from St. Paul, lead to eternal death. To ſay then, that heretics and ſchiſmatics are out of the way of ſalvation, is not judging; for it proceeds from a reſpect for the judgement of God, and from a dread of approving that, which God condemns.

Q. Are not Proteſtants guilty of this charge, which they attempt to throw on Catholics?

A. No Chriſtians are ſo free in their condemnations of other Chriſtians as they are.

Q. How ſo?

---

* 2. Theſ. iii. 4. Tit. iii. 10. 2 John i. 10. † Gal. v. 19.
‡ Mat. vii. 1.

A. They do not heſitate to ſay, that Catholics are fallen into ſeveral kinds of idolatry; and thus judge and condemn to everlaſting flames the many millions of Catholics, which are ſpread over all parts of the world. Without going farther, here are already far more condemned by the Proteſtants, than there would be by following the opinion of Catholics. Moreover they have the boldneſs to ſay, that the honor ſhewn to images, the invocation of Saints, and the adoration, that Catholics render to Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt, is all idolatry. Thus again they doom to the ſame eternal flames, not Catholics only, but all the Chriſtians, that inhabit the ſouth and north: for, except Proteſtants, all other Chriſtians adhere to theſe practices. Thus many millions, beſides Catholics, are judged and condemned by Proteſtants.

Q. Are theſe all, that they condemn?

A. Theſe are only a ſmall part, for their judgements reach up to paſt ages. They make no difficulty of calling our belief of the Euchariſt idolatry, which nevertheleſs they themſelves acknowledge to have been the faith of the Catholic Church for above ſix centuries. They give the ſame appellation to the veneration of images, which they admit to have been eſtabliſhed in the Church theſe ſix or ſeven hundred years. The invocation of Saints is looked upon in the ſame light, though it is allowed to have been the practice of the Church for above twelve centuries. What millions of Chriſtians of paſt ages here receive their ſentence! For the Scriptures tell us plainly, that *idolators ſhall not poſſeſs the kingdom of God.** When Catholics then point out to Proteſtants the threats denounced againſt their ſchiſm, they certainly cannot reply, *judge not that you may not be judged.*

Q. What may be ſaid of the Catholics on this head?

A. That they are really moſt averſe from condemning:

* 1 Cor. vi. 9. 10.

for they, whom we condemn, are ſuch as condemn others; they are almoſt always men, who in the formation of their ſociety, have condemned all other Chriſtians then living. This raſhneſs of theirs in condemning ſo many other Chriſtians, is the principal reaſon that compels the Catholic Church, to pronounce ſentence againſt them.

Q. To return to the ſubject that we have quitted, why do you ſay that there cannot be ſalvation in two ſeparate communions? The Holy Scriptures mention ſome, who continued faithful among the ten tribes of Iſrael, though they were ſeparated from that of Juda.

A. Thoſe, who retained their fidelity among the ten Tribes of Iſrael, had no communication with the ſchiſmatical aſſemblies of Dan and Bethel. The Holy Scriptures acquaint us, that they went into Judea to join the faithful tribes, * whom they call the *inheritance of the Lord.* There were always ſome prophets in the country of the ten tribes, ſuch as Elias, Eliſeus, and Micheas. Hence we ſee that when four hundred of Achab's prophets were brought to Joſaphat, he aſked whether there were not to be found a prophet of the Lord, whom he might conſult. † The Holy Scriptures remark, that the Iſraelites, who remained faithful and oppoſed the ſchiſm, met at the aſſemblies of the prophets at the new moons and ſabbaths; ‡ and even that they took with them the firſt fruits, which they would have carried to the Temple, if they had had liberty to do it. § Beſides theſe faithful oppoſers of the ſchiſm, who refuſed to join the aſſemblies of Dan and Bethel, at the time of the ſolemnities, when they ſhould have gone up to Jeruſalem, there were always ſome, who contrived to go to the Temple, and there faithfully paid their tenths and firſt fruits. This is related of Toby in particular. ‖

Q. Have you any other proof, that the faithful did

---

* 2 Chron. xi. 13. 16. xv. 9. xxx. 4. 18.
† 2 Chron. xviii. 6. xxviii. 9. ‡ 2 Kings iv. 23. § Ibid. 42.
‖ Tob. i. 5, 6.

not join the ſchiſmatics in the worſhip of God, on the altars of Dan and Bethel?

A. If that had been lawful, all the Levites would not have abandoned the ten tribes, at the time of their ſeparation; whence they were forced to take ſacrificers from among the loweſt claſs of the people. *

Q. Notwithſtanding what you have ſaid, Elias called the altars of the ſeparated Iſraelites, the altars of God. *Lord*, ſays he, ſpeaking of the perſecution of Achab, *Lord they have thrown down thy altars.* †

A. Elias does not ſpeak there of the altars of Dan and Bethel, which Jeroboam had made the center of his ſchiſm. Achab had no deſign againſt thoſe altars, and the Holy Ghoſt ſo far from looking upon them as altars of God, calls them the *altars of falſe gods, and of the devils,* ‡ thereby plainly condemning all who aſſiſted at thoſe ſchiſmatical aſſemblies. The altars, before which the Iſraelites, who abhorred the ſchiſm, adored, were thoſe that had been erected by the faithful before the building of the temple, and which are mentioned in many different parts of the Holy Scriptures. § God permitted the Jews to continue their ſacrifices in thoſe places; which was particularly reaſonable in regard of thoſe who could not go to the temple. Theſe are the altars, of the demolition of which the prophet Elias complains.

Q. Have you any other proof in the Holy Scriptures, which ſhews, that the abetters of the Samaritan ſchiſm were out of the way of ſalvation?

A. Our Lord determines this in plain words, for the Samaritan woman having propoſed this difficulty, *our fathers adored on this mountain, and you ſay, that at Jeruſalem is the place where men muſt adore,* he does not

---

* 1 Kings xii. 31. xiii. 33. † 1 Kings xiii. 19. ‡ 2 Chron. xi. 15.
§ Gen. viii. 20. xii. 8. xiii. 8. xxii. 9 xxiv. 25, &c. Judges xxi. 4. 1 Sam. vii. 17.

anſwer, that ſalvation might be found in either of the ſocieties, that is to ſay, both among thoſe who adored at Jeruſalem, and thoſe who adored in Samaria, but on the contrary, he gives a clear deciſion, that ſalvation was to be found among the Jews only: *Salvation*, ſays he, *is of the Jews.* *

CHAP. III.

Of the Holineſs of the Church.

Q. QUOTE ſome paſſage of the word of God concerning the holineſs of the Church.

A. St. Paul ſays, *Chriſt loved the Church, and delivered himſelf up for it, that he might ſanctify it, cleanſing it by the laver of water in the word of life; that he might preſent it to himſelf a glorious Church, not having ſpot or wrinkle, nor any ſuch thing, but that it ſhould be holy and without blemiſh.* † *You are*, ſays St. Peter, *a choſen generation, a kingly prieſthood, a holy nation, a purchaſed people.* ‡

Q. Does this mark prove, that ſectaries are not the Church of Jeſus Chriſt?

A. They cannot tell us that their Church has always been holy, ſince they teach that it had embraced idolatry, and that they were compelled to reform it, for which reaſon they took the name of the *Reformed Church.*

Q. Are there any other inſtances, in which we may ſee that the mark of holineſs is not to be found in their ſociety?

A. This is diſcovered by the contempt they have for many works of holineſs, that are recommended by the

* John iv. 30. 22. † Eph. v. 25, 27. ‡ 1 Pet. ii. 9.

Holy Ghoſt, and which the greateſt ſaints have practiſed with the moſt ardent zeal. Confeſſion, for example, is not in uſe among them, and much leſs the voluntary renunciation of all the goods of this world, for the ſake of dedicating themſelves entirely to the ſervice of God. They make ſuch a jeſt of the vows of celibacy, that they do not even think them binding after they are made. They look with contempt on all exerciſes of mortification, ſuch as we admire in the life of St. John the Baptiſt, and many others.

Q. Point out ſome other convincing conſiderations, that they are not a Holy Church.

A. Their principles lead to the abolition of ſeveral precepts of Chriſtian Morality, though they do not obſerve this tendency. They hold, that nothing is of faith, but what is enforced by ſuch clear paſſages of the Holy Scriptures, that they cannot receive any other explication. Now they cannot produce any ſuch to prove the unlawfulneſs of marrying one's own ſiſter, or of ſelf murder, or other ſins, which it may be improper to mention. Prohibitions of theſe things are clear to thoſe only, who look into the Holy Scriptures with ſubmiſſion to the authority of the Church. For which reaſon, when we ſee Proteſtants ſhrinking with horror from theſe crimes, as well as ourſelves, the effect muſt be attributed to a long eſtabliſhed good cuſtom. Their religious principles are not the cauſes of it.

Q. How can one aſſert, that the Catholic Church is holy, whilſt one ſees in it ſo many, whoſe lives are irregular, or whoſe devotion is not free from ſuperſtition?

A. The Holy Scriptures do not permit us to charge thoſe things upon a Religion, which that Religion does not compel us to believe or practiſe. Great would have been the ſin of thoſe, who ſhould have cenſured the Jewiſh Church, before the coming of our Lord, for the irreligion found among the Sadducees, or for the

hypocriſy of the Phariſees, or the avarice of the Prieſts. It would have been the ſame to have laid to the charge of the Chriſtian Church of Corinth, the diſorders that were diſcovered among the paſtors and people, in the celebration of the Euchariſt, and in moſt of their religious aſſemblies. It cannot certainly be a leſs crime to impute to the Catholic Church thoſe faults, that are ſuppoſed to be committed by its rulers or profeſſors.

Q. What principles then ought one to aſcribe to a Church?

A. One may aſcribe to it whatever the Councils, that have been received by that Church, or its univerſal approbation, compel us to believe or do, as likewiſe whatever is done in conformity to its faith. This it is that ought to make us acknowledge the Catholic Church to be a Holy Church; for all its eſtabliſhed principles are moſt holy, and thoſe Catholics, who withdraw their affections from all earthly things to fix them on God, and who adore him in ſpirit and truth, truly obey the doctrine, the maxims, and ſpirit of their religion.

Q. Draw in regard to the Catholic Church, and the Proteſtant, a general concluſion from the following truth, viz. that one ought not to attribute any thing to a Church, except it be conformable to the principles of its doctrine.

A. It follows from thence, as I have juſt ſaid, in regard to the Catholic Church, that we ought not to impute to it the ill, that may be ſeen in it, if it be in direct oppoſition with its principles and doctrine. On the other hand, it is clear from the ſame truth, in regard to the reformed Church, that a great part of the good that is done in it, ought not to be aſcribed to it; becauſe, as I have already ſhewn, ſuch good is not preſcribed by its principles. So far from it, its principles, which are to believe that the viſible Church may err in the moſt eſſential points, and that nothing ſhould be admitted as certain, except it can be manifeſtly ſhewn in Holy Writ; its principles, I ſay,

lead to the annihilation of many doctrines of faith, as well as precepts of Chriſtian morality.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Catholicity of the Church.

Q. WHY did you ſay that one of the principal marks of the Church was its Catholicity?

A. Becauſe, according to the Holy Scripture, the Church of Jeſus Chriſt was to be ſpread over the whole world. *In the laſt days*, ſays Iſaias, *the houſe of the Lord ſhall be prepared on the top of the mountains, and all nations ſhall flow unto it.** *Enlarge the place of thy tent*, ſaid God by the mouth of the ſame prophet, ſpeaking of the Chriſtian Church, *for thou ſhalt paſs on to the right hand and to the left: and thy ſeed ſhall inherit the Gentiles.*† *And there ſhall come*, ſays our Lord, *from the eaſt, and the weſt, and the north, and the ſouth, and ſhall ſit down in the kingdom of God.*‡ *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* § *You ſhall be witneſſes to me in Jeruſalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and even to the utmoſt part of the earth.* ‖

Q. Does this mark of the Church of Jeſus Chriſt ſhew, that the ſociety of Proteſtants is not the ſociety of Jeſus Chriſt?

A. Certainly; for they have not this mark. At the beginning of the Reformation, they were confined to a ſmall Canton in Germany. They were not the Church then, as one of the principal characters was wanting, by which the Holy Scriptures point it out to us. It was

* Is. i. 2. † Is. liv. 3. 4. ‡ Luc. xiii. 29. § Mat. xxviii. 19. ‖ Acts i. 8.

not therefore allowable to join their ſociety at that time; and if it was not the true Church then, it never afterwards could be erected into the true one by the ſin of thoſe, who united themſelves to it when out of the way of truth.

Q. This is enough concerning the beginning of their ſociety. Can it be ſaid that it ſpread itſelf afterwards to the extent marked by the word of God for the Chriſtian Church?

A. By no means; for it never was known in the greateſt part of the world. And we ſee, that ſo far from *gaining ſtrength* and *encreaſing*, as the Church ought to the end of the world,* it is continually ſplitting into new parties and ſects. The Proteſtant Church is not then an univerſal Church, but a Church in a certain Canton of the univerſe. For which reaſon they pronounce their own condemnation as often as they repeat in the ſymbol, *I believe the* Catholic *Church, or the Church that is Catholic or univerſal.*

Q. The Church is repreſented in many parts of the Holy Scripture as a little flock, or as a way that few walk in. †

A. Theſe paſſages are not meant of the external body of the Chriſtian Church, to which the Holy Ghoſt tells us all nations were to flock; ‡ but are to be underſtood of ſuch of the faithful, as being in communion with the viſible Church, retire from the company of mankind, by renouncing the world and ſelf-love, to dedicate themſelves wholly unto God. One may likewiſe add, with great appearance of reaſon, that theſe inſpired words are principally to be applied to the infant ſtate of the Chriſtian Church. It was then *the grain of muſtard ſeed, the ſmall piece of leaven, the cloud like a man's*

---

* Mat. xiii. 30. Coloſs. i. 6. † Luke xii. 32. Mat. vii. 13. 14.
‡ Is. ii. 2. 3.

*foot, the ſtone cut out of a mountain to ſtrike the ſtatue.** But the Apoſtles themſelves lived to ſee the dawn of thoſe times, in which the Church was to be the great tree, that would ſtretch forth its branches on all ſides, the paſte all leavened, the heavens darkened with clouds, the ſtone, which having broken the ſtatue, became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. *Their ſound*, ſays St. Paul, *hath gone forth into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the whole world.*† Nor does the Holy Ghoſt ſpeak of this ſpreading of the primitive Church, as if it would be of ſhort duration, but as if it would increaſe till the end of the world. *Let the wheat and cockle*, ſays our Lord, *grow together until the harveſt.*‡ *The Goſpel*, ſays St. Paul, *is in the whole world, and bringeth forth fruit and groweth.*§

Q. How can you tell us, that the Church in communion with that of Rome is a Catholic or univerſal Church, ſince there are ſeveral parts of the world in which it is not eſtabliſhed?

A. In moſt parts where it is not eſtabliſhed, it is nevertheleſs viſible, as a light upon a candleſtick is in a chamber, or as a city built upon a mountain is in a plain around it.‖ This cannot be ſaid of other ſocieties, that are unknown in diſtant parts of the world. Beſides, it has a ſufficient claim to the title of Univerſal, according to the Holy Scriptures, if it is to be met with in different places in all the parts of the known world. The Church in the time of the Apoſtles was far from having ſpread ſo wide as the Catholic Church at preſent. Yet we have juſt ſeen, that the Holy Ghoſt ſaid at that time; *Their ſound hath gone forth into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the whole world; and the Goſpel, which you have heard, is preached in all the creation that is under heaven.*¶

---

* Matt. xiii. 30. 33. 1. Kings xviii. 44. Dan. ii. 34. 35.
† Rom. x. 18. ‡ Mat. xiii. 30. § Coloſs. i 6
‖ Matt. v. 14. 15. ¶ Coloſs. i. 23.

Q. Is there any thing elſe to be remarked on this ſubject?

A. There is the greateſt reaſon to believe, that the nations, that are not already obedient to the Church, are deſigned to become ſubject to it, from the great zeal with which God inſpires it to labour for their converſion. This reflection furniſhes another mark of the Church, and diſcovers to us, that the Proteſtants are not the true Church. Our Lord ſaid before his aſcenſion into heaven, *Go teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.** Hence whatever Church is not ſolicitous to inſtruct the nations, that are not baptized, in order to gain them to Jeſus Chriſt, is not the Church of Jeſus Chriſt. A backwardneſs for this kind of labour is one of the defects of Proteſtants. It is very remarkable, that Providence ſeems to have made it eaſy for them by means of their commerce, to have undertaken the inſtruction of nations, which are ignorant of the name of our Lord, to the end, that diſregarding ſo holy a work, they might more manifeſtly demonſtrate that they are not the true Church. This work is the glory of the Catholic Church; for, in all paſt ages, and at this preſent time, many of its children puſhed on by an Apoſtolic zeal, have and do leave all things and venture their lives among the moſt barbarous nations, to inſtruct Pagans, and baptize them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.

Q. Make ſome obſervations on this mark, and on the time of the reformation in particular.

A. God had deſigned at that time to give proofs of a moſt extraordinary mercy to the Pagans, by the converſion of ſeveral millions of them in the Eaſt and Weſt Indies, as if he intended to repair the loſs which the Church had ſuffered in Europe, by the ſchiſm of ſeveral

* Matt. xxviii. 19.

millions of its children. Now God choſe the Catholics to effect this great work. The Reformers had no part here. Yet certainly if they had been the true Church, God would have reſerved this honor for them, which, according to the Holy Scriptures, was to be one of the moſt illuſtrious marks of his Church, and would not have beſtowed ſo diſtinguiſhing an honor upon their adverſaries, the Catholics.

CHAP. V.

Of the fourth Mark of the Church, which is its Title of Apoſtolic.

Q. WHY did you ſay that one of the principal marks of the Church is, that it is *Apoſtolic?*

A. The reaſon is, becauſe the Holy Scripture deſcribes it as a body formed by the Apoſtles, which would remain till the end of the world. The word of God likewiſe repreſents its miniſtry, as a miniſtry, which Jeſus Chriſt at firſt entruſted to the Apoſtles, and which was afterwards, without interruption, to ſerve for the edification of the faithful till the end of ages. *Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt; and behold I am with you all days, even to the conſummation of the world.** *He gave Paſtors and Doctors, for the perfecting of the ſaints, for the work of the miniſtry, for the edifying of the body of Chriſt: till we all meet into the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God.*† Theſe paſſages, and many others of the ſame kind, evince, that there was to be in the

* Matt. xxviii. 19. 20. † Ephes. iv. 11. 13.

church a conſtant ſucceſſion of an apoſtolic miniſtry, of an apoſtolic doctrine, and of an apoſtolic ſociety.

Q. Do theſe things ſhew, that the Proteſtants are not the Church of Jeſus Chriſt?

A. They prove it clearly; for they can by no means boaſt that their miniſtry, their principles, or their aſſemblies have been continued and held in an uninterrupted ſucceſſion from the days of the Apoſtles. It is univerſally known, that thoſe who drew together that ſociety in the laſt age, eſtabliſhed different miniſters, (at leaſt in many places) from thoſe they found in the church at that time; that they eſtabliſhed principles contrary to thoſe, that were then taught in every part of the church, and that they held different aſſemblies from thoſe, which the Chriſtians of their time frequented, to worſhip God, to hear his word, and receive his ſacraments.

Q. What ſuperiority hath the Catholic Church in this point?

A. It is apoſtolic in every ſenſe of the word. It is ſo certain, that its paſtors have ſucceeded the Apoſtles in an uninterrupted ſucceſſion, that no one can charge it with ever having eſtabliſhed any, who did not ſucceed thoſe, who were deſcended from the Apoſtles. Its ſociety has ſo aſſuredly ſucceeded the Church, which the Apoſtles founded, that no one can reproach it with ever having made any ſeparation: and its doctrines or principles are ſo evidently and invariably a continuation of the doctrine of the Apoſtles, to which it hath always adhered, that no proof can be brought, that it hath at any time made profeſſion of eſtabliſhing any article of belief, which was not then taught in all the parts of the Church. Theſe three characteriſtics demonſtrate two things, that the Proteſtants are not the Church of Jeſus Chriſt, and that this title belongs to the Catholic Church.

CHAP. VI.

A Continuation of the ſame Subject, in which it is ſhewn, that the Separation of the firſt Reformers from the Church, evinces clearly, that their Society is not the Church of Jeſus Chriſt.

Q. AS this is a matter of great importance, explain more at large, how their ſeparation is a proof of what you have aſſerted.

A. We muſt take particular notice, that ſuch a ſeparation from the communion of the whole viſible Church, is not any where commanded in the Holy Scripture, and that we there find no example of it. Among the holy men, whom in great numbers the ſacred writings preſent to our imitation, there is not an inſtance of any one, that ſeparated from the viſible church at the time of its greateſt corruption. In that great variety of precepts, which are in the word of God, there is no command for ſuch a ſeparation. Hence thoſe, who have embraced what is called the Reformation, cannot glory, with the leaſt appearance of reaſon, that they have acted conformably to the Holy Scriptures.

Q. Can you draw no other proofs from the ſilence of the Holy Scriptures on this head?

A. It is to be obſerved not only, that we do not find any thing in them to authoriſe a ſeparation from all the aſſemblies of the viſible Church, in order to form new ones, but likewiſe that they ſay nothing upon a ſubject, in which it would have been indiſpenſably neceſſary, that we ſhould have been inſtructed, if ſuch a ſeparation ought ever to have taken place. In fact, as all errors, in the opinion of the Proteſtants, are not a juſt cauſe for a ſeparation, the Holy Scriptures ſhould have pointed out by ſome clear mark, proportioned to the capacities of all, that ſhould, at any time, be called upon

either to make or join ſuch a ſeparation, that the ignorant, as well as the learned, might diſtinguiſh what are eſſential principles, and what are not; what errors would make it a duty to withdraw from the whole viſible Church, and what would make the ſame a crime. But the Holy Scripture has been ſo evidently ſilent on theſe heads, that the moſt learned cannot clearly ſhew from it, what are fundamental errors, as they are called, and what are not ſo. This profound ſilence is a demonſtration, that the Holy Ghoſt ſaw there never would be a legitimate cauſe for ſuch a ſeparation from the Church.

Q. To ſay no more about the ſilence of the Holy Scripture, is there nothing poſitive againſt this ſeparation?

A. It is condemned expreſsly in the New Teſtament. It is the character, by which St. Paul points out heretics. *Of your own ſelves*, ſays he, *ſhall ariſe men ſpeaking perverſe things, to draw away diſciples after them.* * In another place this holy Apoſtle reckons, not only hereſies, but likewiſe ſchiſms and diviſions among the works of the fleſh; *of which*, ſays he, *I foretel you, as I have foretold to you, that they who do ſuch things, ſhall not obtain the kingdom of God.* † St. John proves the ſectaries of his time to have been Antichriſts, becauſe they ſeparated from the Church. *Even now*, ſays he, *there are become many Antichriſts. They went out from us.* ‡

Q. Are St. Paul and St. John the only Apoſtles, who, in expreſs terms, have condemned a ſeparation?

A. The other Apoſtles have done the ſame, not only thoſe whoſe writings we poſſeſs, but thoſe of whom we have none. As they knew, that after their deaths, many innovators would ariſe, who under different pretexts would erect new ſocieties, and that the greateſt part of mankind were not capable of diſcerning by private ex-

* Acts xx. 30. † Gal. v. 20, 21. ‡ 1 John xi. 18, 19.

amination, which was the true ſenſe of the Holy Scripture, they were attentive in the Churches, that they founded, to point out a mark, by which the moſt ignorant might diſtinguiſh falſe teachers. This mark was the ſeparation we ſpeak of. As the falſe teachers were thoſe, who ſeparated from the Church, ſo the true teachers were ſuch as remained united to it.

Q. Whence do you know, that this was the language of the Apoſtles in this particular?

A. The teſtimony of St. Jude the Apoſtle convinces us of it. *My dearly beloved, be mindful of the words which have been ſpoken before by the Apoſtles of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who told you, that in the laſt time there ſhould come mockers, walking according to their own deſires in ungodlineſſes. Theſe are they, who ſeparate themſelves, ſenſual men, having not the Spirit.** Thus we are taught by the Apoſtles, that during the times of the Chriſtian Church, (which the Holy Ghoſt in the New Teſtament calls the *laſt time*, †) thoſe, who ſeparate from the communion of other Chriſtians, are falſe teachers, or mockers of the truth, followers of their own appetite, and void of the Spirit of God.

Q. What is there peculiar in this teſtimony of the Holy Scripture?

A. There is not any other in all the New Teſtament, that is thus aſcribed to the Apoſtles in general. As in theſe words, a truth of the greateſt importance is conveyed to us, becauſe in it all other truths are ſecured, the Holy Ghoſt has admoniſhed us, that all the Apoſtles were careful in inculcating it, that all might know, how ſtrictly they were bound never to loſe ſight of it.

Q. Did the complaints, that the Reformers made of the morals of ſome Eccleſiaſtics, of their neglect of inſtructing the people ſufficiently, or of their tolerating

---

* Jude 17—19. † Acts xi. 17.

ſome popular abuſes, make them excuſable in quitting the Church?

A. Jeſus Chriſt regulated the duty of the faithful on theſe occaſions, when he ſaid of the conductors of the Jewiſh Church: *They have ſitten on the chair of Moſes: all therefore whatſoever they ſhall ſay to you, obſerve and do: but according to their works do ye not.* * The Holy Spirit repreſents the Church as a houſe, in which there are veſſels for honorable, and veſſels for diſhonorable uſes; as a field, in which there is good grain and cockle, that will not be ſeparated till the harveſt; and like a net full of good and bad fiſhes, out of which the good will not be choſen till on the ſhore. † For which reaſon the faithful to the end of the world, will be bound to tolerate the ill, that may be in their time among the members of the Church, and to oppoſe it, not by ſeparating from its ſociety, but only by their ſighs, by their words, by their example, and by their ſufferings, if neceſſary.

Q. Have we any examples, as well as commands, in the Holy Scriptures, by which we may learn, that we never ought to ſeparate from the Church?

A. There is ſcarce a book in the word of God, in which this duty is not marked out to us by the conduct of the faithful; as there ſcarce ever was a time, in which they were not afflicted at the ſight of great corruptions among thoſe, with whom they lived in the boſom of the Church.

Q. Produce ſome examples from the Old Teſtament.

A. There were often great diſorders among the Jews, in ſuch manner, that under the reign of Achaz, and that of Manaſſes, an altar for idolatrous uſes was erected in the Temple, and the morning and evening ſacrifice offered in honor of Idols. ‡ Idolatry was countenanced

---

* Mat. xxiii. 2, 3. † 2 Tim. ii. 20. Mat. xiii. 25. & 47.
‡ 2 Kings xvi. xxi. & xxiv. 4.

by their leaders, and power employed to compel the people to ſubmit. Yet the Prophets did not perſuade the faithful either to chuſe new prieſts to offer ſacrifice, or to hold new aſſemblies. The faithful permitted themſelves to be ſlain: on which account it is ſaid, that Manaſſes ſhed much innocent blood. Yet the ſpirit of God did not inſpire them to ſeparate. In the time of Ezechiel, God ſhewed this prophet the moſt ſhocking idolatries in the Temple, and called it an *infamous place of proſtitution.* * Yet the faithful did not think of a ſeparation. The Holy Scriptures only obſerve, that they mourned for theſe abominations. †

Q. Have we no example of the ſame conduct in the time of the ancient Church.

A. We read in the New Teſtament, that at the time of our Saviour's birth, thoſe in the higheſt ſtations did not only tolerate, but even gave encouragement to many impieties, ſuch as the ſuperſtition of thoſe who made devotion conſiſt in external practices, ‡ the hereſy of many, who denied the reſurrection of bodies, § the profanation of the Temple, by thoſe who trafficked in it; ‖ and the avarice and hypocriſy of others, who, under the cloak of piety, plundered the houſes of widows, ¶ and allowed children to refuſe aſſiſtance to their parents in diſtreſs. ** Nevertheleſs, the bleſſed Virgin, St. Joſeph, St. Zachary, St. Eliſabeth, St. Simeon, St. Ann, and others of the faithful of that time remained in union with ſo corrupted a people.

Q. What was the conduct of our Lord and the Apoſtles in this regard?

A. As it was the will of God that the Jewiſh Church ſhould ſtill continue, Jeſus-Chriſt, notwithſtanding theſe great abuſes, was preſent at the ſacrifices and other

---

* Ezech. viii. 5—10. xvi. 39. † Ezech. ix. 4.
‡ Mat. xxiii. 5. § Marc xii. 18. ‖ Mat. xxi. 12.
¶ Mat. xxiii. 14. ** Mat. xv. 5, 6.

public devotions, and received the ſacraments that were then adminiſtered. Even after the Jews and their Chiefs had added to the irreligion, I have mentioned, the condemnation and crucifixion of our Lord, the Apoſtles did not deſiſt from viſiting the Temple to join in the public worſhip of God. *They were*, ſays St. Luke, *continually in the Temple praiſing and bleſſing God.* * This is an unanſwerable proof, that, how great or public ſoever abuſes may be, yet they will not juſtify a retreat from the aſſemblies of the ancient body of the Church, in order to form new ones.

Q. Perhaps the reaſon of this conduct was, that the ſervice of God was reſtrained to the Temple; ſo that it does not regard the Chriſtian Church.

A. The Temple was a figure of the viſible church, in which God will be ſerved by Chriſtians: whence we ſee in the New Teſtament, that the abuſes of a Church did not compel the faithful to leave it.

What proof is there for this aſſertion?

A. In the time of St. Paul, there were the greateſt diſorders in the Church of Corinth, diviſions among the Paſtors, † a public and univerſal ſufferance of a moſt ſhameful inceſt, ‡ a hereſy contrary to the reſurrection, § profanations of the holy Euchariſt, ‖ and a contempt of what was edifying in religious aſſemblies. ¶ Yet the faithful, that were among them, never thought of withdrawing from theſe aſſemblies under a pretence of forming others more pure. If abuſes ſo public among the paſtors and people did not move them to ſeparate from a particular Church, ſurely the complaints of ſome irregularities cannot juſtify any one in abandoning the univerſal Church.

Q. Does the New Teſtament ſupply us with any other examples on this ſubject?

---

* Luke xxiv. 53. † 1 Cor. iii. 3. ‡ Ibid v. 2.
§ Ibid xv. 12. ‖ Ibid xi. 20, 21. ¶ Ibid xiv. 26—38.

A. St. Paul repreſented the Galatians as ſenſeleſs people, who had permitted themſelves to be led aſtray by a goſpel, deſtructive of that of Jeſus-Chriſt.* Our Lord, in the third and fourth chapter of the Apocalypſe, acquaints us, that ſome Churches of Aſia were filled with crimes, that were tolerated by the paſtors. *Thou ſuffereſt*, ſaith Jeſus-Chriſt, *the woman Jezabel, who calleth herſelf a propheteſs, to teach and to ſeduce my ſervants to commit fornication, and to eat of things ſacrificed to idols.* † Yet we do not find, that the faithful in thoſe Churches withdrew to ſeparate aſſemblies. Our Lord ordered the Faithful of the Churches, in which the rulers tolerated ſuch dreadful evils, not to form new ones, but to adhere to the good they had learned, till he ſhould come to deliver them. *As for you* (the faithful at Thyatira) *who have not this doctrine, and who have not known the depths of Satan, as they ſay, I will not put upon you any other burden; yet that which you have, hold faſt till I come.* ‡ We cannot but gather from this example and the preceding anſwer, that if it is not permitted to ſeparate from a particular Church, on account of abuſes, that may be tolerated by the Paſtors; it muſt be a much more heinous crime to ſeparate from the whole viſible Church on the ſame pretext.

Q. Is there no example in the Holy Scripture of people, who have ſeparated from the ancient body of the Church, to call together other religious aſſemblies, ſo that the Holy Ghoſt may have had occaſion to determine this point?

A. I have already mentioned the disjunction of the ten tribes, that was made by Jeroboam. The Holy Ghoſt, in the Old Teſtament, expreſsly condemns Joram and Jehu, kings of Iſrael, for continuing in this ſchiſm,§ notwithſtanding they had ſignalized them-

---

* Gal. iii. 1. † Apoc. ii. 20. ‡ Ibid 24—25.
§ 2 Kings iii. 3. x. 29—31.

ſelves by rooting out the idolatry of Baal. Our Lord likewiſe, in his diſcourſe with the Samaritan woman, had occaſion to decide this matter. This ought particularly to be remarked, becauſe at that time, as well as in the reigns of Joram and Jehu, the Jews and Samaritans did not differ in a point, that related to idolatry, but to ſchiſm only. This we learn likewiſe from the hiſtory of Antiochus; for the Samaritans, during his perſecution, were ſuch profeſſed enemies to idolatry, that to defile their Temple, the king dedicated it to Jupiter, as he did that of Jeruſalem. *

Q. Continue your reflections upon the diſcourſe of Jeſus Chriſt with the Samaritan woman.

A. In it we ſee that the Samaritans adored only the Creator of heaven and earth, as the Jews did, ſo that they did not differ about the object but the place of worſhip: *Our fathers adored on this mountain, and you ſay, that at Jeruſalem is the place where men muſt adore.* The Samaritans expected the Meſſias as well as the Jews. *I know*, ſaith the woman, *that the Meſſias cometh (who is called Chriſt.)* † They performed many good works. Our Lord ſeems even to have raiſed them above the Jews in this reſpect, for in one of his parables, he ſets before our eyes a Samaritan, touched with compaſſion for a diſtreſſed object, whoſe wounds had been cruelly diſregarded by a prieſt and a levite. ‡ He hath expreſsly remarked that the only one of the ten lepers who returned to give thanks was a Samaritan. § Yet when he determined in what place they ought to be, in order to ſave themſelves, his deciſion was againſt the Samaritans: *Salvation*, ſays he, *is of the Jews.* ‖ Notwithſtanding all the faith and good works of the Samaritans, yet ſalvation was not found among them, becauſe they were a ſchiſmatical ſociety, whoſe

* 2 Mach. vi. 2. † Jo. iv. 20 and 25. ‡ Luc. x. 33.
§ Luke xvii. 16. ‖ Jo. iv. 22.

leaders and aſſemblies had not come down in an uninterrupted line, from the leaders and aſſemblies which Moſes had eſtabliſhed. On the contrary, notwithſtanding the dreadful diſorders, that then reigned among the Jews, ſalvation was to be ſought for in their ſociety, becauſe they were deſcended from the leaders and aſſemblies, which Moſes had eſtabliſhed: *Salvation is of the Jews.*

Q. May not one ſay, that a ſeparation is a great crime in thoſe who firſt begin it; but that it does not extend to thoſe, who did not make it, and who being born in a ſchiſmatical ſociety continue in it, without any ſuſpicion of being ſeparated from the Church, and perform good works in it?

A. Such a notion would be contrary to the deciſion of our Lord againſt the Samaritans: for though that diviſion had ſubſiſted above ſeven hundred years, he did not excuſe it, but decidedly declared, that ſalvation was not to be found among the Samaritans, but only among the Jews. This is a clear deciſion of the diſpute between the Catholics and the Proteſtants.

Q. Why hath God taught us this duty of never ſeparating from the Church in ſo many books of the Holy Scriptures; ſo that there is not any other point of doctrine more frequently repeated?

A. It is to convince us, that an inviolable attachment to the unity of the Church is one of our moſt eſſential duties, and that they who form, or live in a ſeparation from it, put themſelves into the way of eternal perdition.

Q. Yet the Holy Scripture ſays: *Go out from her,* (Babylon) *my people, that you be not partakers of her ſins, and that you receive not of her plagues.* *

A. This objection ſuppoſes what cannot be proved, that the viſible Church would become a Babylon; it

* Apoc. xviii. 4.

would even be blaſphemy to aſſert it, ſince we are aſſured in many paſſages that ſuch an evil will never fall upon her. I mean that paſſage, in which Jeſus Chriſt foretels that the gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt the Church, and thoſe, in which he gives a promiſe of his own preſence, and of the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt to the end of the world. *

Q. What then is to be underſtood by that Babylon, which the Holy Ghoſt commands the faithful to quit?

A. It is certain that by this Babylon, we ought not to underſtand, as the Proteſtants do, any Chriſtian Church, that had fallen into idolatry. For if the Holy Ghoſt had intended any thing of that kind, he would have marked this defiled Church by the name of Jeruſalem or Samaria, cities which had formerly been in alliance with God, and not by that of Babylon, which never had been favored in like manner. For we ought particularly to remark, that the Holy Ghoſt never gives the harlot of the Apocalypſe the name of an unfaithful repudiated ſpouſe, as the prophets frequently do to Jeruſalem and Samaria, when they reproach them for their idolatry, but always gives her the appellation of harlot, and only charges her with fornication in the ſame manner as the prophets did the Pagan cities, that never had been in alliance with God; for inſtance, the cities of Tyre, Ninive, and Babylon. † This paſſage of the Apocalypſe therefore cannot be underſtood of a Chriſtian Church, that had embraced idolatry, but is to be applied to ſome Pagan city or ſociety.

Q. It is not ſufficient to refute the Proteſtant interpretation of thoſe words, *Go out from Babylon, my people:* explain the true meaning of them.

A. The Fathers ſay, that by Babylon we may at all times underſtand the wicked, that are in the Church,

---

* Mat. xvi 8. xxviii. 20.

† Iſ. xxiii. 15, 16. Nahum iii. 4. Iſ. xlvii. 3.

and perſecute the good. We ought to ſeparate ourſelves from ſuch, by deteſting their maxims, and guarding againſt the effects of their pernicious example.

Q. Do you know any other explanation of thoſe words; *Go out from Babylon, my people?*

A. According to the firſt meaning of this oracle, Babylon ſignifies Pagan Rome, from which the faithful were to ſeparate, when they ſhould ſee God pour down vengeance upon it, in puniſhment of its idolatry and perſecutions of the Church in its infancy.

Q. On what is this explanation founded?

A. On the Holy Scripture; * for the primary deſign of the Apocalypſe was to comfort the Chriſtians in the time of St. John, and in particular the ſeven Churches of Aſia in their afflictions, by foretelling them, that their perſecutors, who were the authors of their ſufferings, would one day be deſtroyed, and that the Chriſtians would ſucceed to their power. Now who ever perſecuted the Chriſtians if Pagan Rome did not? She was the woman, who uſed her power to ſupport idolatry, and was drunk with the blood of the Saints.

Q. Why doth the Holy Ghoſt make uſe of the appellation of *Babylon*, rather than of Rome?

A. To have publiſhed that the Holy Ghoſt had foretold the deſtruction of the idolatrous Roman Empire, would have encreaſed the fury of the perſecutors; it was with reaſon therefore, that a matter of ſo great importance was veiled with thoſe difficult forms of expreſſion and obſcure viſions, that we find in the Apocalypſe.

Q. In what ſenſe then are we to underſtand the command of quitting Babylon, that we may not be involved in ruin?

A. We are by it to underſtand, that God would deprive Rome of its riches and ſplendor, by the hands of the barbarous kings, that were tributary to it. As

---

* Apoc. xvii. 1, 2, 6.

the havock they were to make, was particularly deſigned againſt the Pagans, the Chriſtians at thoſe times were admoniſhed to withdraw from them, leſt they alſo ſhould be involved in the ſame ruin. So we find our Lord gave notice to the firſt Chriſtians to flee from the midſt of the Jews, as ſoon as they ſhould behold the vengeance of God ready to fall upon them. *

Q. Have you nothing more to add concerning this paſſage of the Apocalypſe, which is ſo frequently quoted by the Proteſtants?

A. It may likewiſe be ſaid, that thoſe words, *Go out from Babylon, my people*, do not contain a command, but only a prediction, of the delivery of the perſecuted Chriſtians, and of the ruin of the Pagans that perſecuted them. It is common for the Holy Ghoſt to deliver predictions in terms of command: thus in theſe words, *let them that are in Judea flee to the mountains*, † our Lord foretold, that the preſence of the Roman army would compel many Jews to fly to places of retreat. Theſe very words, *go out from Babylon*, in the mouths of the Prophets who firſt made uſe of them, mean no more than a prediction of the delivery of the Jews from captivity: *Prepare ye the way of the Lord*, ſaith Iſaias, alluding to this delivery, *make ſtraight in the wilderneſs the paths of our Lord*; ‡ that is to ſay, the ways from Babylon to Jeruſalem ſhall be ſecure and open, by the permiſſion they ſhall have to return to their own country. In like manner theſe words, *Go out from Babylon my people*, mean no more than a prediction of the delivery of Chriſtians from the perſecutions of Pagans. Thus it appears, that the Proteſtants pretend to find a command of ſeparating from the ancient body of the Church, in a paſſage, which attentively conſidered, neither ſpeaks of a Church at all, nor even contains any command.

---

* Luke xx. 20. 21. † Mat. xxiv. 16.
‡ Iſ. xl. 3. Jer. l. 8. li. 6. 45.

CHAP. VII.

Of the First Reformers.

Q. BESIDES this ſeparation, which is a general defect, and common to all innovators in religious matters; have you nothing in particular to lay to the charge of the firſt Reformers, which may ſhew, that their ſociety is not the Church of Jeſus Chriſt?

A. The Holy Scriptures compel us to reproach the greateſt part of them, as Calvin himſelf, with having thruſt themſelves into the public miniſtry, without any miſſion: for we learn from them, that an approved vocation is neceſſary in the Miniſters of the Church: *neither doth any man*, ſays St. Paul, *take the honor to himſelf, but he that is called by God.* * We do not ſee throughout the word of God any one in the Eccleſiaſtical miniſtry, that had not a miſſion, either from thoſe, who were eſtabliſhed before him, or, where that was wanting, from heaven itſelf, which miſſion was proved by miracles to be ſuch, both to himſelf and others; ſuch was the miſſion of Moſes and the Apoſtles. Though the Holy Scriptures at different times repreſent the greateſt corruptions among the members of the Church, yet we do not read of any, who, under pretence of a vocation, or for any peculiar advantage that might accrue to the Church, or on account of extraordinary parts, or in ſhort, by the choice of the people, ever uſurped the functions of the ſacred miniſtry. Our Lord himſelf has been pleaſed we ſhould be taught, that he did not glorify himſelf to become a high prieſt, † and that he was called by oracles, which clearly marked him

---

* Heb. v. 4. † Ibid. v. 5.

out, and which God repeated at the Jordan and on Mount Thabor, that his vocation might be inconteſtable.

Q. What concluſion do you draw from this?

A. That the Holy Scriptures compel me to look upon the Reformers, not as true Paſtors, but Seducers, ſince they were neither called to the ſacred miniſtry by a lawful ſucceſſion to the ordinary paſtors of the Church, who had been eſtabliſhed before them, nor by miracles calculated to prove their miſſion to be from heaven, and of an extraordinary kind.

Q. Can one juſtly reproach them with not having wrought miracles, ſince they pretend to teach nothing but the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, which the Apoſtles had ſufficiently confirmed by miracles?

A. Though Elias did not teach the Iſraelites any other doctrine but that of Moſes, yet it was neceſſary for him to confirm his words by miracles, becauſe he oppoſed all the people. * But what is ſtill more deciſive on this ſubject, is what our Lord ſays of himſelf, that if he had not wrought miracles, the obſtinacy of the Jews would have been excuſable; *if I had not done among them the works that no other man hath done, they would not have ſin.* † The Reformers did not pretend that their doctrine was more clearly contained in the New Teſtament, than that of our Lord's was in the Old. Beſides their doctrine was generally oppoſed, as that of our Lord's was by the Jews: whence, as they wrought no miracles, the ſpirit of the Goſpel ſhews clearly, that there could not be any harm in rejecting their tenets.

Q. Pleaſe to prolong this proof againſt the firſt Reformers.

A. We may obſerve that God judged it neceſſary, that the Apoſtles ſhould work miracles, though both the prophetic writings and the miracles of Jeſus Chriſt

---

* 1 Kings xviii. 22, 39. † Jo. xv. 24.

ſhewed their title to the miniſtry. It was likewiſe neceſſary then for the firſt Reformers to have performed miracles, if, as they ſay, God had deſigned they ſhould reform the Church. We may add moreover, that it was more neceſſary that they ſhould work miracles than the Apoſtles. For they in effect undertook what the Apoſtles never did, to reject the public traditions of the Church and thoſe principles, which the Church maintained to have flowed from the very ſource of religion through all generations. The Apoſtles, were not ſo enterpriſing in that regard; ſo far were they from it, that they ſupported the ſacred traditions of the Jewiſh Church. *I ſtand*, ſays St. Paul, *under judgment for the hope of the promiſe that was made by God to our fathers: unto which, our twelve tribes, ſerving night and day, hope to come.** *I have done nothing againſt the cuſtom of our fathers.*† *For the hope of Iſrael I am bound with this chain.*‡ The Apoſtles only aſſerted, that the promiſe was accompliſhed which the Jews had ſo long expected; an aſſertion which was nowiſe contrary to any univerſal teſtimony of the Jews. *The Jews*, ſays Feſtus, *have certain queſtions againſt him of one Jeſus deceaſed, whom Paul affirms to be alive.* §

Q. By what other defect does the word of God make it manifeſt that the Reformers were not ſent by God?

A. It always exhibits a conſtant uniformity in matters of faith among thoſe, who have been really ſent by Almighty God. If there was any difference among the Apoſtles, it did not relate to doctrine, but to ſome particular facts. They never aſcribed one another's doctrine to the devil. Beſides, their differences were never attended with injuries, anathemas, and an unrelenting bitterneſs, that followed them to their graves.

Q. Apply this reaſoning to the firſt Reformers.

---

* Acts xxvi. 6. † Acts xxviii. 17. ‡ Ibid. 20.
§ Acts xxv. 19.

A. There were moſt ſcandalous animoſities between Luther and the principal Reformers. His rage was excited at their firſt appearance, nor was it appeaſed to the laſt moment of his life. We ought particularly to remark, that theſe incurable diviſions were about the fundamental points of doctrine, and articles of the greateſt importance, as was that about the holy Euchariſt. They all pretended that the Church was miſtaken in the explication of the Holy Scripture, and that God had raiſed them up in an extraordinary manner to teach the true interpretation of it. But when they were aſked, what was the true interpretation, which God had inſpired them to teach his Church, Luther, Zuinglius and Calvin gave three interpretations contrary to each other, and reciprocally reproached one another with teaching damnable doctrine. Thus they rendered it impoſſible for their followers to judge, which of theſe Doctors they ſhould prefer, who all perſiſted that God had raiſed them up in an extraordinary manner to bring them to the light. God does not permit ſuch diviſions in his kingdom: *For God is not a God of diſſention, but of peace.* * *Every kingdom*, ſays our Lord, *divided againſt itſelf ſhall be brought to deſolation, and houſe upon houſe ſhall fall.* † Hence it is clear that the word of God will not allow me to look upon thoſe as his ſervants, whoſe wrath was implacable, and doctrine contradictory in the moſt important matters of faith.

Q. Continue to ſet before us ſome other reproaches grounded on the Holy Scripture, which may make it clear, that the firſt Reformers were not men ſent by God, and of courſe that their followers are not the true Church.

A. The Holy Scripture informs us, that the devil is the father of lies, ‡ and that he does not act againſt his own kingdom. § Hence, what comes from him is evil,

* 1 Cor. xiv. 33. † Luc. xi. 17. ‡ John viii. 44. § Luke xv. 18.

and not ſubverſive of his empire. Zuinglius declares, with regard to his boaſted proof for the explanation, which he gives of the words of the inſtitution of the Euchariſt, that he learned it from a certain admoniſher, of whom he ſays, *I do not know whether he was white or black.* * We have ſomething more explicit from the chief of the Reformers. For Luther ſaid, and even left in writing, that the devil taught him part of the doctrine of the Reformation, to wit, that which relates to private Maſſes. *Once*, ſays he, *being wakened about midnight, Satan began to call to me and to ſay: Hearken, Martin Luther, moſt enlightened Doctor.* †

After this preface, he relates a long converſation, in which the devil proves to him that private Maſſes are contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and refutes all that Luther ſaid in their ſupport. We do not find in the Holy Scripture, that God ever made uſe of the devil to be the firſt teacher of a truth unknown to the world. So much to the contrary, that when our Lord was accuſed of working miracles by the power of the devil, he denied the charge, by telling them that the devil never acted contrary to the intereſt of his kingdom. Now he would have acted contrary to his intereſt, if he had been the firſt who admoniſhed Luther, that a cuſtom, which was eſtabliſhed through the whole Church was deſtructive of ſalvation, if it really had been ſo. Thus the Holy Scriptures will not allow me to look upon the Reformers as men ſent by God, when I find their leader proclaim that the devil was the inſpirer of part of his doctrine.

Q. Does the word of God put us in mind of any other fault that is obſervable in the Reformers?

A. It repreſents the devil as the author of calumny, and it is from thence that he has his name. Now

---

* Zuin. de ſubſid. Euch.

† De Miſs. priv. et unct. Sacerd. l. 7. fol. 228.

calumny was one of the principal means made uſe of by the firſt Reformers againſt the Church, to induce the ignorant to quit it. They charged it with numberleſs things, that are contrary to its doctrine, as ſuperſtition in the people, ignorance in its miniſters, and diſorders among the religious. They imputed many other deteſtable crimes to it, without the leaſt foundation. Thus * Calvin, though brought up in the boſom of the Church, did not ſcruple to aſſert in a ſermon at Geneva, that forty years before his time, the Church of Rome thought as little of calling Jeſus Chriſt mediator and advocate, as it did of calling Mahomet redeemer. The Holy Scriptures, which repreſent calumny as coming from the devil, do not permit me to believe, that men, who were forced to have recourſe to ſuch means to delude people, and withdraw them from obedience to the Catholic Church, could have any extraordinary commiſſion from God.

Q. Does the word of God ſupply us with any other ſimilar reaſon for cenſuring the firſt Reformers?

A. I find there that all, who were really called by Almighty God to a work of that kind, which the firſt Reformers boaſted of having been authorized to undertake, were always men of eminent ſanctity. Elias was of this character in the Old Teſtament, and the Apoſtles in the New. It may be ſaid, without the leaſt injury to juſtice, that we do not find any veſtiges of extraordinary ſanctity in the lives of theſe pretended Reformers. We need no other proof of this than that violent heat, which is ſeen in their writings, and which often diſcovered itſelf in their actions. There are no appearances of that extraordinary ſanctity, which was ſo remarkable in all, whom God had, at any time, ſent to reform the Church. The Holy Scriptures, which repreſent thoſe, whom God had really choſen, as men of a moſt ſingu-

* Serm. 14. on the 1ſt to Tim. p. 72.

lar holineſs, do not allow me to believe, according to the notions of Proteſtants, that St. Francis Xavier, Dom. Bartholomew de Martyribus, St. Charles Boromæus, and other Holy men, who at the time of the reformation were ſo zealous in promoting virtue and reforming diſcipline in the boſom of the Catholic Church, men, whoſe affections were evidently raiſed far above all the things of this world, and whoſe labours tended ſolely to promote the glory of Jeſus Chriſt, were men abandoned by God, preachers of idolatry and children of a repudiated Church; and that the Reformers, whoſe conduct was ſo remarkably inferior to that of theſe great Saints, were the temples of the Holy Ghoſt, reſtorers of the glory of our Lord, and miniſters choſen by him to beautify and reſtore his Church. This is contrary to the promiſe of Jeſus Chriſt, who has told us, that thoſe, who were moſt faithful in his ſervice ſhould be moſt enlightened in his doctrine: *If any man*, ſays he, *will do the will of God; he ſhall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I ſpeak of myſelf.* *

Q. Beſides this general reproach of a want of ſanctity among the Reformers, is there not room for cenſure on account of ſome particular inconteſtable facts?

A. The Holy Scriptures teach us to look on thoſe, who marry, after having conſecrated themſelves to the Church, and promiſed never to enter into ſuch bonds, as rebels to Jeſus Chriſt, as men, who have violated their faith, as guilty of perjury, and liable to eternal torments. This is the ſentence, which St. Paul pronounces againſt the young widows of his time, who had conſecrated themſelves to the ſervice of the Church. † This ſame ſentence extends to the pretended Reformers, who all took wives, though they were almoſt all either prieſts or religious, who had made vows of chaſtity. In renouncing the Catholic Faith, they at the ſame

* John vii. 17. † 1 Tim. v. 11. 12.

time publiſhed to the world, that they renounced their vows. Soon after their abjuration, they entered upon wedlock, and often choſe ſuch for their partners, as they had induced to break their vows. Thus the word of God inſtructing us to look upon the firſt Reformers, as men puſhed on by ſenſual pleaſures to break the yoke of Jeſus Chriſt, and as men, who having involved themſelves in the guilt of a perjury, of which they made profeſſion never to repent, were by that expoſed to the eternal wrath of God, the Sacred Oracles, I ſay, do not permit us to believe, that God had choſen them to reform the faith of his Church, and to erect a new one, if the ancient body ſhould refuſe to ſubmit to their tenets, and conform to their eſtabliſhment.

Q. Draw a general concluſion from all theſe reproaches, with which the Holy Scripture compels you to charge the firſt Reformers.

A. I am under the neceſſity of concluding, that their Society is not the Church of Jeſus Chriſt. It is a body formed on human motives only. It is therefore manifeſt that God did not intend to make it his Church, and to forſake the ancient body, which had been in poſſeſſion of that title, from the remote days of the Apoſtles.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Succeſſion of Paſtors in particular Churches.

Q. AFTER ſpeaking of the four principal marks of the true Church, can you give any other, which is at the ſame time clear, and adapted to perſons of ordinary capacities?

A. There is in the Catholic Church a ſucceſſion of

Paſtors and Biſhops, who ſucceed one another, and who, with their ſucceſſion, have delivered to us the doctrines of faith, and the true worſhip of the Catholic Religion, from the beginning of the Church of Jeſus Chriſt, till the preſent time. Hence we have, in favor of the Catholic Church, a clear and demonſtrative proof, which the moſt ignorant, and the moſt illiterate, can eaſily comprehend.

Q. Have you any grounds, in the word of God, for this proof of the Catholic Religion, taken from the ſucceſſion of Paſtors and Biſhops?

A. As the New Teſtament was written at the beginning of the Church, it is not poſſible to find in it a ſucceſſion of Paſtors and Biſhops of particular churches. At the ſame time, we have there a ſatisfactory account of the principal churches, founded by the Apoſtles and governed by Biſhops, whoſe uninterrupted ſucceſſion in point of doctrine and religious worſhip is delivered down to us, by the channel of eccleſiaſtical hiſtory.

Q. Have you not at leaſt ſome proof of this ſucceſſion in the Old Teſtament; and is there no mention made of it in the New?

A. We find the ſucceſſion, of which we ſpeak, clearly marked out in the High Prieſts of the old law, and from their uninterrupted ſucceſſion, we are authoriſed to conclude, that the temple of Jeruſalem, was that of the living God; as on the other hand, that the temple of Mount Garizim, in Samaria, was a temple of Schiſmatics, eſtabliſhed by human authority, in oppoſition to the expreſs prohibition of Almighty God, declared to us in ſeveral paſſages of the Holy Scriptures.

Q. Can you explain in what manner, and upon what occaſion, the temple of Garizim was eſtabliſhed?

A. We learn from Joſephus, that Sennabalat, governor of the province, built it for his ſon in law Manaſſes, brother to the High Prieſt of Jeruſalem, whoſe name was Jaddus. This temple was conſecrated to the Lord, as well as that of Jeruſalem. Manaſſes

was appointed High Prieſt of the temple in Samaria, becauſe he had been excluded from exerciſing that office in Jeruſalem, for acting contrary to the law of God in taking to wife a foreigner. Thus after violating the law in one point, he involved himſelf in the ſchiſm of all thoſe, who, in open rebellion, adhered to Jeroboam, abandoned the worſhip of the true God, and adored the molten calves of gold, which the king of Iſrael had ſet up in Samaria, to hinder his ſubjects from going to Jeruſalem, and to debar them from being reunited to the two tribes, from which they had formerly ſeparated themſelves.

Q. What circumſtances took place afterwards, relative to the temple of Samaria?

A. The temple being built with great magnificence, and exceedingly enriched by Sennabalat on purpoſe to withhold the Jews from going up to Jeruſalem, ſo much captivated their minds, that they had no inclination to take a journey to Jeruſalem, to aſſiſt at the ſacrifices offered there on the feaſts of Eaſter, and the other ſolemnities of the year. Moreover, as policy and idolatry had occaſioned the eſtabliſhment of this temple, and had retained the Jews in the violation of the law of God, in like manner the politics and the ſpirit of idolatry preſerved the temple of Samaria, at the time when the impious king Antiochus pillaged and profaned Jeruſalem, and exerciſed his cruelties againſt the tribes of Juda and Benjamin. The king treated the Samaritans with humanity, and ſpared their temple, becauſe they had preſented a petition to him, praying that their temple might be conſecrated to Jupiter, ſurnamed, according to the Vulgate, the Stranger, or, according to Joſephus, the Grecian. Whilſt the Samaritans, by this petition, rendered themſelves highly criminal, in becoming idolaters through choice, a great number of the Jews at Jeruſalem loſt their lives for oppoſing the impious orders of Antiochus, and they never could be

induced to consent to that most abominable profanation of their temple, when that wicked king ordered it to be consecrated to Jupiter Olympian.

Q. What inference do you draw from this history, to prove the succession from the Old Testament?

A. I conclude that the temple of Mount Garizim becoming afterwards famous, not only on account of the great number of people, that resorted thither from among the ten tribes, but likewise for those rebels and libertines who abandoned the service, and trampled upon the precepts of the true God, that they might live without restraint and without law; the Samaritans rashly maintained their's to be the true and ancient temple, alledging that the patriarch Jacob had paid his homage of adoration on their mountain, and not in Jerusalem; that to worship the true God it was not necessary to go up to Jerusalem; and that it was lawful to offer sacrifice in several different places at a distance from that city.

Q. What did the faithful Jews answer to these difficulties, and how did they defend themselves against the Samaritans?

A. They alledged the succession of high priests, who descended from Aaron, and whom they proved to have continued till the time of Solomon, under whose reign was built their most magnificent temple of Jerusalem. Thus whilst they proved their's to be the most ancient, and the only temple built by the command of God, they made it manifest at the same time, that the temple of the Samaritans was of a much later standing, as it was only built, in the time of Darius and Alexander the Great, by a pagan governor, who intended thereby to gratify the ambition of his son-in-law Manasses.

Q. Is there no positive proof of this succession of Pastors and Bishops to be found in the New Testament?

A. We there find the succession of Pastors, or High Priests of the Old Testament. Mention is made of the

temple of Jeruſalem in the converſation, which paſſed between our Saviour, and the Samaritan woman. She on her part, thinking to juſtify her temple and religion, maintained that their father Abraham had adored on that mountain, that their temple was the true place of worſhip, and that it was not therefore neceſſary to go and aſſiſt at the ſacrifices offered in Jeruſalem. Our Saviour, on the other hand, gave his opinion in favor of the Jews and of the temple of Jeruſalem, and aſſured her, that ſalvation was only to be found among the Jews, becauſe they adored in the temple, which the Lord had commanded to be built, and becauſe they offered ſacrifice in the place, which he had appointed. He further added, that if Abraham, Jacob, David, and others, had erected altars for the purpoſe of offering ſacrifice elſewhere, they never did ſo but under the expreſs orders of Almighty God, whom they obeyed without reply, and without oppoſition.

Q. Do not you find likewiſe in the New Teſtament, ſome poſitive proof of the ſucceſſion of Biſhops?

A. We meet there, as it has already been mentioned, with the commencement, and ſource of it; as alſo with the promiſe of its uninterrupted continuation, in thoſe words of our Saviour to his Apoſtles, *Behold I am with you, all days, even until the conſummation of the world.* * Jeſus Chriſt there promiſes not only to be with his Apoſtles, who ſurvived him but a ſhort time, but alſo with their ſucceſſors, to enlighten and direct them in their miniſtry, without interruption, till the end of the world. Upon the authority of this infallible oracle, we maintain, that the Catholic Church is aſſured, that Jeſus Chriſt baptizes, teaches, and diſcharges all the functions of the ſacred miniſtry, with the true ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles, the Biſhops, and other inferior Paſtors of the Church.

---

* Matt. xxviii. 20.

Q. Have you no other paſſage in the New Teſtament to confirm the promiſe of this ſucceſſion?

A. St. Paul aſſures us, that Jeſus Chriſt has given to his Church *ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and other ſome Evangeliſts, and other ſome Paſtors and Doctors, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the miniſtry, for the edifying of the body of Chriſt, till we all meet into the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the ſon of God, unto a perfect man, unto the meaſure of the fulneſs,* * according to which Jeſus Chriſt is to be formed in our ſouls. As this perfection and fulneſs will not be accompliſhed till the end of the world; it is neceſſary that the power and ſanctification of the Holy Ghoſt be communicated to all the Paſtors, who ſucceed one another by an ordinary miſſion. The reaſon is obvious, becauſe Jeſus Chriſt, the ſovereign paſtor of ſouls, who alone is immortal, being a Prieſt for ever according to the order of Melchiſedec, changing the prieſthood, changed alſo the law by his own extraordinary miſſion, as well as by that of his fore-runner in the preaching and miniſtry, which the Lord had entruſted to him, and which he had foretold by his prophets. Neither of theſe miſſions, however, as will be ſhewn in the ſequel, can be found with the pretended reformers.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Privilege granted to the Church of never falling into Error.

Q. HAVING pointed out the principal marks of the Church of Jeſus Chriſt, and having proved that

* Eph. iv. 11. 13.

that title does not belong to the reformed churches, but to the Catholics, pleaſe to explain, which is the principal reaſon, that ought to induce us to acknowledge and ſubmit to the Church.

A. It is the promiſe, which we find recorded in the Holy Scriptures, that it ſhall be under the direction of the Spirit of truth till the end of the world.

Q. For what reaſon did God favor it in ſo diſtinguiſhed a manner?

A. One of the principal reaſons for this great privilege is, that all the members of the Church are not endowed with learning, but the greater part are ignorant and uninformed, incapable of examining all points of faith by the Holy Scriptures, and therefore ſtand in great need of ſome authority to govern them, on which they may rely with ſecurity. The ways of ſalvation are to be open to theſe little ones, who, as we learn from the Holy Scriptures, ſeem in a particular manner to be deſigned for it: *I give thanks to thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, becauſe thou haſt hid theſe things from the wiſe and prudent, and haſt revealed them to little ones.* * Now there is not any other way except that of ſubmiſſion to the authority of the Church, which is adapted to ordinary capacities.

Q. Have not the ignorant as much difficulty to diſcern the true Church, from ſo many different ſocieties, as they would have to diſcover what principles are moſt conformable to the Holy Scriptures?

A. By no means; for we ſee in the Holy Scriptures, that a ſolid examination of the particular articles of faith, by this divine word, depends on many things, that are out of the reach of the ignorant. For example, a compariſon muſt be made of the different paſſages that have relation to the ſame ſubject, and a knowledge be acquired of the force and true meaning, that

* Matt. xi. 25.

many expreſſions had at the times and on the occaſions, they were made uſe of by the ſacred writers; the cuſtoms of the Jews ſhould be underſtood, and many other things be known, which require no ſmall ſhare of erudition. It is much eaſier to acquire a knowledge of the authority, that we ought to ſubmit to; becauſe it is the will of God that this authority ſhould at all times be ſo much raiſed above all others, and be diſtinguiſhed by ſuch characters, as may eaſily be diſcerned by the moſt ignorant.

Q. That you may prove this truth by ſome example, ſhew us how it might be adhered to, at the time that our Lord was on the earth.

A. Every one might then eaſily ſee that our Lord, who wrought ſo many miracles, and who called himſelf the Meſſiah at the time, which all the Church of Iſrael had marked out for his coming, was rather to be credited, than the Synagogue, which, at the time when it was to be deprived of its authority, denied him to be the Meſſiah.

Q. That we may prolong this ſubject, ſhew us that a man of common underſtanding is capable of diſcerning, that the Proteſtant Church is not ſo worthy of credit in articles of religion, as the Catholic.

A. Even thoſe of the meaneſt intellects may perceive, by the knowledge which they ought to have of their own weakneſs and deficiency, that the Proteſtant Church, and ſuch as have made a ſimilar ſeparation, cannot be the true Church. Theſe ſocieties, in fact, were formed by teaching mankind, contrary to what every man muſt experience in his own breaſt, that every one is not only bound, but likewiſe adequate, to the taſk of examining all points of faith, and that he can give a better explanation of the Holy Scriptures, than the whole viſible Church. It is as eaſy for the moſt ignorant to know, that they have no ſuch capacity, as that they have not wings to fly with. It is then in their power clearly to ſee, that ſocieties which, like the Proteſtant,

ſuppoſe ſuch a capacity, are not the true Church; that the Catholic Church, which makes a profeſſion of obedience to lawful authority, and teaches that God hath eſtabliſhed his Church to direct us, is more worthy of belief, and that the moſt eligible way is to ſubmit to its guidance.

Q. Bring ſome other proofs to convince us, that a knowledge of the true Church is acquired with much leſs difficulty, than a knowledge of all the particular articles of faith, by examining the word of God.

A. We have a knowledge of the true Church, from many expreſs paſſages of the Holy Scriptures, in which God promiſes in the cleareſt terms, that his Church ſhall never be deceived. It is certain that we have not paſſages of equal clearneſs on all the articles of faith; and thus the greater part of mankind, who want knowledge and light to diſcuſs all, that the word of God ſays on each article of faith, have ſufficient to diſcover in this holy word, that every ſociety, which, like the Proteſtant, has begun by aſſerting, that the whole viſible Church had miſtaken the faith, are illegal ſocieties, and that the Catholic Church, which always maintained, that the true Church neither had erred, nor could err in matters of faith, muſt be the true Church.

Q. Continue your reflections in regard to the difference there muſt be, betwixt acquiring a knowledge of the Church, and a knowledge of all the different articles of faith.

A. The latter knowledge cannot be attained, as I have already ſaid, without much diſcuſſion, for which a large ſhare of erudition is neceſſary: but the Church is known by many ſenſible marks. For example, it is a ſociety which hath exiſted, and had a conſtant ſucceſſion of Paſtors ever ſince the time of the Apoſtles; during the ſame time it has been of ſuch extent, that one may with reaſon ſay, that it hath been ſpread round the whole world; it commonly hath beheld all ſocieties fall to nothing, which during that time had riſen up

againſt it; it hath been ſingularly diſtinguiſhed above all other ſocieties, by numbers of men of extraordinary ſanctity, who have flouriſhed in its boſom, and who, as our Lord had promiſed, have wrought ſeveral miracles;* and it hath always laboured, with great zeal, in the converſion of Pagan nations, according to the command contained in the laſt words of Jeſus Chriſt, when he left this earth to aſcend to heaven. Great numbers, who want that genius, knowledge and ſtrength of underſtanding, which are neceſſary for any one, who undertakes to diſcover with any ſolidity, every article of faith, by examining the Holy Scripture, have ſufficient to perceive ſuch external ſenſible marks, and to judge from them, that the Proteſtant and other Churches, in which they do not ſee any ſuch marks, are not the Church of Jeſus Chriſt; and that, on the contrary, the Catholic Church, in which they ſee them, hath a moſt conſpicuous authority, that diſtinguiſhes and raiſes it above all other Churches, and that it is the Church, which we ought to hear.

Q. What concluſion do you draw from all that you have ſaid?

A. That whatever objection may be ſtarted to the contrary, it manifeſtly appears from the Holy Scriptures, that the way of ſalvation ought to be proportioned to the comprehenſion of common underſtandings; and for that reaſon it is neceſſary, that the church ſhould have a promiſe of not erring in matters of faith; becauſe ſubmiſſion to the Church is the only way, that is adapted to the weakneſs of mankind in general.

Q. Does it appear, on examining the Holy Scriptures, that this privilege of not erring, was requiſite, even for the ſake of the moſt learned members of the Church?

A. Such examination ſhews, that it was neceſſary for

* Marc. xvi. 17.

all ſorts of Chriſtians. It is often a matter of diſpute, whether ſuch a book is a part of the Holy Scriptures or not, a point which cannot be determined without appealing to the teſtimony of the Church. There are ſeveral paſſages in the Holy Scriptures, that appear to be contradictory, and which cannot be cleared up without having recourſe to the Church. There are many paſſages, in which we muſt not adhere too cloſely to the letter; ſuch as thoſe in which we are forbidden to call our friends to dinner, and to place the rich above the poor. * The Church only can give ſecurity, that theſe paſſages are not to be taken according to the letter. There are ſeveral commands in the New Teſtament, that only bound the Apoſtles, or the Chriſtians of the firſt ages, ſuch as the command of waſhing one another's feet, and the prohibition of eating blood. † Theſe orders, which were only to take place for a time, cannot be diſtinguiſhed from others, unleſs we can, without danger, rely on the teſtimony of the Church.

Q. That we may ſee this truth in a clearer light, prove it by ſome particular example.

A. I take the waſhing of feet for an example, and I ſay, that if we ſet aſide the authority of the Church, it is clear, that we cannot be certain from the Holy Scriptures only, whether all Chriſtians be not bound to comply with it, in ſuch a manner, that whatever Church ſhould reject ſuch a practice, would on that account ceaſe to belong to the Church of Jeſus Chriſt.

Q. How can this be proved?

A. Though only to mention this truth ſeems to make it clear, yet that we may, with greater perſpicuity, ſee the force of it, I will make a ſuppoſition that all the Church had teſtified, that our Lord, to whom humility was ſo pleaſing, had inſtituted a ſacrament of humili-

---

* Luc. xiv. 12. Jam. xi. 2. 4. † John xiii. 14. Act. xv. 29.

ty, as he did one of charity in the Euchariſt; and that for this end he had ſanctified a cuſtom of the Jews, as he did their baptiſm, to rank it among the firſt of his ſacraments; and that the Apoſtles had taught the Church this doctrine of waſhing feet; and that for that reaſon the Church had always extolled it as a ſacrament, and had obſerved it as ſuch in all ages. I ſuppoſe that the Church had given this teſtimony. Proteſtants cannot make any difficulty of admitting ſuch a ſuppoſition, as they profeſs to believe, that the church has ſaid all theſe things concerning other practices, which the Apoſtles never looked upon as ſacraments. But this ſuppoſition being made, is it not clear that, without making any addition to the words of Holy Scripture, we ſhould have regarded the waſhing of feet as a ſacrament? We ſhould have urged the circumſtance of time, viz. the night that our Lord inſtituted this myſtery, and the proximity of the death of Jeſus Chriſt, as it is recorded in this place by the Spirit of God, that he was ready to paſs out of this world to his Father. * The remark of St. John would have been noticed with regard to the love of Jeſus Chriſt towards his diſciples, which is prefixed to the hiſtory of the waſhing of feet, † as likewiſe the exactneſs of the Evangeliſt in relating all that was tranſacted. The particular ceremonies by which our Lord raiſed the attention of his diſciples, ‡ the conduct of Jeſus Chriſt, who never performed any ſimilar action, the anſwer to St. Peter in oppoſition to the waſhing of his feet, *If I waſh thee not, thou ſhalt have no part with me;* § the expreſs direction which our Lord gave of doing as he had done: *You alſo ought to waſh one another's feet; for I have given you an example, that as I have done to you, ſo you do alſo;* ‖ the holy ſignification of the

* Joh. 13. † Ibid 1. ‡ Ibid. 4 and 5. § Jo. xiii. 8.
‖ Joh. xiii. 14.

ceremony, the rank which St. Paul gives it amongſt the moſt eſſential duties of Chriſtianity,* viz. the education of children, and the comforting the afflicted; all theſe, I ſay, would have been conſidered. We ſhould have urged them all, and inſiſting that the inſtitution of any of the other ſacraments was not better authenticated, we ſhould have deemed all thoſe profane, and diſobedient to the word of God, who ſhould have maintained the waſhing of feet to be an unneceſſary ceremony. And what hinders us from doing ſo now? It is not any thing that we gather from the word of God, nor if we look on the Holy Scriptures only, do we find more there concerning Baptiſm or the Euchariſt, than about the waſhing of feet. It is then, becauſe the Church does not ſpeak in the ſame manner of the waſhing of feet, as it does of Baptiſm and the Euchariſt. It is, in a word, becauſe the Church does not give the teſtimony, which I have ſuppoſed. But in the ſuppoſition, that leſs were ſaid in the Goſpel of the waſhing of feet, than of Baptiſm and the Euchariſt, yet there would appear to be ſufficient to authorize us to receive it as a ſacrament, if the Church had propoſed it as ſuch. This may convince all, who are not entirely blinded by prejudice, that it is the will of our Lord, that we ſhould depend on the teſtimony of the Church, for the meaning of ſeveral paſſages of the Scriptures.

Q. May it not be ſaid, in regard to this difficulty, and others which you have mentioned, that the faithful need only hearken to the ſpirit of God, and follow his inſpirations?

A. The Holy Scriptures ſay, *dearly beloved, believe not every ſpirit, but try the ſpirits, whether they be of God.*† This command extends not only to the boaſted inſpirations of thoſe, of whom we are ſpeaking, but likewiſe to thoſe motions, that we perceive in our own

* 1 Tim. v. 10. † 1 John iv. 1.

breasts. For which reason, an external rule, that we can depend upon, is necessary, by which we may examine, whether that spirit be from God, which makes us give the preference to one explication of the Scriptures before another. It is the want of this examination by some certain external rule, whether the spirit is from God, that induces us to give the preference to a particular sense to the Holy Scripture, that made the Jews believe, that the Old Testament compelled them to reject our Lord, and that under the New, has caused fanatics and innovators *to wrest the word of God to their own destruction.* * For, generally, each society boasts of being conducted by the spirit of God. The only reasonable part then, that we can take in religion, is to submit to the Church. The faith of this Church is the external rule, by which Catholics judge of the Spirit, that conducts them, whether or not it be the spirit of God.

Q. Have we any other proofs in Scripture of this privilege, which the Church has of not erring, besides the necessity of it?

A. We have the express promises of God for it, and the words of the Holy Ghost, concerning the extent of the Church.

Q. How do the words of the Holy Ghost, in regard to this extent, shew that the Church does not err in matters of faith?

A. To understand this thoroughly, we must remark, that the things of which we have the greatest certainty, are such as we know by our own experience, or by that of others, who have seen them. It was for this reason God chose, that the truths of faith, both in their beginning and continuation, should not be speculations discovered by the force of reason, but facts published to the world by witnesses. There are many

* 2 Pet. iii. 16.

proofs of this truth in the Holy Scriptures. Moſes, before his death, taught the Iſraelites what they were to do, in order to know the things neceſſary for ſalvation. *Aſk thy father*, ſays he, *and he will declare to thee: thy elders, they will tell thee.** *How great things*, ſaid the faithful of the Old Teſtament, *have we heard and known, and our fathers have told us! He ſet up a teſtimony in Jacob, and made a law in Iſrael. How great things he commanded our fathers, that they ſhould make the ſame known to their children, that another generation might know them! The children that ſhall be born, and ſhall riſe up, ſhall declare them to their children.* † And in the New Teſtament, our Lord propoſed himſelf as a witneſs of the things that he preached. *We teſtify*, ſaid he to Nicodemus, *what we have ſeen, and you receive not our teſtimony.* ‡ *I ſpeak that*, ſaid he to the Jews, *which I have ſeen with my father.* § One of the principal claims, that the Apoſtles had to the right of preaching, was, that they preached what they had ſeen and heard. *You ſhall be witneſſes to me, ſaid our Lord to them, in Jeruſalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the uttermoſt part of the earth.* ‖ *God*, ſaid the Apoſtles, *hath raiſed up Jeſus Chriſt, and we are witneſſes of theſe things.* ¶ *We have not followed*, ſays St. Peter, *cunningly deviſed fables, when we made known to you the power and preſence of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; but having been made eye-witneſſes of his Majeſty.*** *That which we have heard*, ſays St. John, *which we have ſeen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled, this we declare to you.* †† *The God of our fathers*, ſays Ananias, to St. Paul, *hath pre-ordained thee, that thou ſhouldſt know his will, and ſee the Juſt One, and ſhouldſt hear the voice from his mouth. For thou ſhalt*

---

* Deut. xxxii. 7. † Pſ. lxxvii. 3. 5. 7. ‡ John iii. 11 & 32.
§ John viii. 38. ‖ Acts i. 8. ¶ Acts v. 30. 32.
** 2 Pet. i. 16 †† 1 John i. 1. 2. 3.

*be his witneſs to all men, of thoſe things, which thou haſt ſeen and heard.** The Apoſtles have likewiſe taught, that the Goſpel in after ages would conſiſt of facts, that is to ſay, of things which had been ſeen and heard. *Hold the form of ſound words*, ſaid St. Paul to Timothy, *which thou haſt heard of me in faith.* † *And the things, which thou haſt heard of me before many witneſſes, the ſame commend to faithful men, who ſhall be fit to teach others alſo.* ‡ It was the will of God, that faith ſhould be thus made up of facts, aſcertained by witneſſes. For which reaſon none ought to be hearkened to, in theſe matters, except thoſe, who can us tell they have ſeen, and have heard. No other kind of ſpeech can ſhew us the foundation of faith. Jeſus Chriſt himſelf was willing to eſtabliſh his right to require our aſſent to his doctrine, by ſaying, *I have heard.* § He confirmed that of the Holy Ghoſt in the ſame manner; *whatſoever things he ſhall hear, he ſhall ſpeak.* ‖ The language of the Apoſtles was theſame: We have ſeen, we have heard. Thoſe, that were taught by the Apoſtles, did not differ: we have heard, ſay they, before many witneſſes. The Church, likewiſe, in every age, calls upon all to believe, by ſaying to them, I have heard. God hath made this chain of teſtimonies, that, by a conſtant ſucceſſion of witneſſes, mankind might find a ſure direction in matters of faith. Jeſus Chriſt is the firſt witneſs, *the faithful witneſs*, ¶ as he ſtyles himſelf. After him the Apoſtles were the principal witneſſes; after them the Church is become the witneſs of Jeſus in every age. Jeſus Chriſt is the witneſs of the eternal Father. He heard his Father and gave teſtimony to the Apoſtles: the Apoſtles are the witneſſes of Jeſus Chriſt, they heard Jeſus Chriſt and gave teſtimony to the riſing Church. This Church, in her infancy, was the witneſs of the Apoſtles: ſhe

---

* Acts xxii. 14. 15. † 2 Tim. i. 13. ‡ Ibid ii. 2.
§ John xv. 15 ‖ John xvi. 13. ¶ Apoc. i. 5.

heard the Apoſtles and Apoſtolic men, and gave teſtimony to the next generation. Every generation of the Church, is the witneſs of the preceding, and gives teſtimony to the following generation. Thus faith always is, not a mere ſpeculation diſcovered by reaſon, but a fact aſcertained by witneſſes.

Q. How does this ſhew, that the wide extent of the Chriſtian Church is of ſufficient weight to prove, that it cannot err in its deciſions concerning faith?

A. Becauſe facts are looked upon as certain, when it is evident, that thoſe who give teſtimony of them, cannot have any deſign of deceiving. Thus matters of faith being only facts, ought to be looked upon as uncontrovertible, when we have an entire certitude, that thoſe who give teſtimony of them, do not mean to lead us aſtray. The teſtimony of our Lord was undoubtedly to be depended on, becauſe his ſanctity and miracles were demonſtrations, that he was incapable of deceiving mankind. The teſtimony of the Apoſtles was moſt worthy of belief, becauſe their ſanctity, their miracles, their ſufferings, and the number of their diſciples, whoſe teſtimony concurred with theirs, gave a convincing proof of their averſion to all falſehood. Afterwards when the number of miracles decreaſed, and ſanctity became leſs conſpicuous, theſe arguments of ſincerity had leſs force: but this was compenſated by the number of witneſſes, who multiplied exceedingly. For the Chriſtian Church, even in its infancy, but particularly in after-times, contained in its boſom great numbers, who lived ſeparated in different nations. Its teſtimony then is, and always was, moſt deſerving of belief, becauſe it is impoſſible to imagine, that either in the beginning, or afterwards, it could have any deſign of giving a falſe teſtimony. It is incredible that, in the beginning of the Church, ſuch numbers of people ſhould aſſert, that they had heard the apoſtles and their diſciples teach ſuch an article, if they never had heard them. It is impoſſible, that in after-times, ſo many

different people ſhould agree to ſay, we have been told by the preceding generation, that the apoſtles taught ſuch an article, if they had not heard them. It is for this reaſon, that what the Holy Scriptures ſay, concerning the extent of the Catholic Church, is a plain proof, that it cannot err in the teſtimony it gives concerning faith.

Q. Say ſomething more to give an additional weight to this proof.

A. We muſt obſerve, that when the enquiry relates to public facts, the unanimous conſent of a numberleſs crowd of witneſſes makes the teſtimony certain. Thus in regard to public facts, that are diſtant in ſituation, as that there is ſuch a place as Conſtantinople, we believe them, on the teſtimony of thoſe, who affirm them. Common ſenſe compels us to admit the ſame in regard to public facts, that have happened at a diſtance of time, as that Jeruſalem was taken by the Romans. This principle has ſuch force, that we ſhould be aſhamed to ſay, we doubt of the truth of thoſe facts, which are confirmed by the unanimous voice of thoſe ſocieties, that make up the body of Mahometans; as for example, that Mahomet came at a certain time, that he publiſhed the Alcoran, and taught ſuch and ſuch an article. If we ſhould even travel into more Southern countries, that are unknown to us, and ſhould there find numberleſs people, that had been ſeparated from each other for a thouſand years, who, notwithſtanding their diſtance from each other, and their conſtant diviſions, ſhould all with one conſent teſtify, that before theſe thouſand years, certain men came to change the religion of their country, and teach ſuch and ſuch articles, how barbarous ſoever theſe people might be, we ſhould believe theſe public facts, on account of the agreement we ſhould find in regard to them, notwithſtanding the multitude of theſe people, their diſtance, or their diviſions. The Church then having been, as the Holy Scriptures teach, from its very beginning, a body com-

poſed of different people, which, according to the prediction of the Holy Ghoſt, has always increaſed, we ought to believe it, when with one aſſent it ſays: the apoſtles firſt taught the world ſuch and ſuch an article, and I have given teſtimony of it through all generations and in all times. This is only aſking you to give that credit to the Chriſtian Church, which common ſenſe will not allow you to refuſe to Mahometans or Barbarians.

Q. Produce ſome examples from the Holy Scriptures, that are applicable to this point.

A. God himſelf acknowledged the inviolable fidelity of mankind in regard to public facts, when, that there might be no doubt of the law of Moſes being divine, he made ſix hundred thouſand men witneſſes to the publication of it. As this fact was ſo public at its firſt promulgation, and the people of Iſrael, to whom it was intruſted, were always ſo numerous, and divided in ſo many different manners, it would have been abſurd at any time, in any of the following ages, to have rejected the teſtimony, which the Jews gave of its publication. For this reaſon it was that they always ſaid with confidence: *We know that God ſpoke to Moſes.* * The publication of the Articles of Faith, of which Chriſtianity is compoſed, was ſtill more public than that of the law, becauſe the Apoſtles taught them, and directed others to do the ſame, not to one people only, but to a great number of kingdoms. Thus the Church having always increaſed, according to the promiſes given it in the Holy Scriptures, no one could ever reaſonably refuſe to hear it, whenever it gave teſtimony concerning any article of faith.

Q. Can we draw any other reflection from the Holy Scriptures concerning this ſubject?

A. It is obſervable, that to corroborate the teſtimony

---

*. John ix. 29.

of the Jewiſh Church, concerning the divinity of the books of Moſes, the coming of the Meſſiah, and the reſurrection of the dead, God permitted the ſchiſm of Samaria, that theſe two people being divided, their teſtimony might have greater force in regard of theſe truths. God hath likewiſe under the New Teſtament permitted, that the teſtimony of his Church, in regard to articles of faith, ſhould receive an additional weight, by that of thoſe ſocieties, which ſeparated from it. Common ſenſe does not permit us to reject the teſtimony given concerning thoſe matters of faith, in which we find an agreement among them.

Q. Pleaſe to add ſome other inſtructions taken from the Holy Scriptures on this head.

A. Our Lord ſhews us, that there can be no danger of error, in admitting the teſtimony of men concerning public tranſactions, that is to ſay, ſuch facts as have been perceived by the ſenſes of many of them: for he reprehends the *incredulity* of thoſe diſciples, who would not believe thoſe, of whom there were many, who had ſeen him after his reſurrection.* Our Lord looks on their teſtimony, as of ſufficient force to carry conviction, and blames ſuch as preſumed to oppoſe it.

Q. Does this paſſage prove the certainty of the teſtimony of the Church at all times?

A. If the teſtimony of ſome men aſſerting, that they had been eye-witneſſes of the reſurrection of our Lord, was ſuch a proof as ſhould not have been rejected by any, the teſtimony of an hundred thouſand, inſtructed by the apoſtles, and affirming, that they had heard them preach ſuch and ſuch an article, and had ſeen them work ſuch and ſuch a miracle, was a more ſtriking proof, that the Apoſtles had taught ſuch doctrines, and wrought ſuch miracles. Thus the ſecond generation, or the ſecond age of the Chriſtian Church, had more reaſon

* Mark xvi. 14.

in this regard, if one may be allowed to ſay ſo, to receive the teſtimony of the firſt generation or age, in relating the faith of the Apoſtles, than the firſt generation had to embrace that of the Apoſtles, who ſaid they had ſeen our Lord riſen from the dead. As the number of witneſſes increaſed in after ages, ſo did the weight of the teſtimony of the Church. For which reaſon all, who preſume to ſet aſide this teſtimony, in whatever age it may be, act not only contrary to ſound reaſon, but likewiſe ſtand in oppoſition to our Lord himſelf: for on looking back on this teſtimony in its origin, when it was in its weakeſt ſtate, on account of the ſmall number of witneſſes, we find him *reprehending the incredulity* of thoſe who refuſed to yield to it. *

Q. After having proved, that what the Holy Scriptures ſay concerning the extent of the Church, lays us under the ſtricteſt obligation of ſubmitting to its teſtimony, ſhew us, as you promiſed, where this obligation is expreſſed in the Holy Scripture.

A. We find it in many places of the Old and New Teſtament.

Q. Quote ſome paſſages of the prophets on this head.

A. For brevity's ſake I will cite but few from Iſaias: *For the mountains ſhall be moved*, ſaith God, by this prophet, ſpeaking of the Chriſtian Church, *and the hills ſhall tremble: but my mercy ſhall not depart from thee, and the covenant of my peace ſhall not be moved, ſaid the Lord, that hath mercy on thee;* † *and thou ſhalt be founded in juſtice; no weapon that is formed againſt thee ſhall proſper: and every tongue that reſiſteth thee in judgment, thou ſhalt condemn. The nation and the kingdom that will not ſerve thee ſhall periſh;* ‡ *and there ſhall come a Redeemer to Sion. This is my covenant with them, ſaith the Lord: my Spirit that is in thee, and my words that I have*

* Mark xvi. 14. † Iſ. liv. 10, 14, 17. ‡ Iſ. lx. 12.

put in thy mouth, ſhall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy ſeed, nor out of the mouth of thy ſeed's ſeed, ſaith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever. * The ſame prophet ſays in another place, where he ſpeaks of the viſibility, and infallibility of the Church: *Upon thy walls, O Jeruſalem, I have appointed watchmen, all the day and all the night, they ſhall never hold their peace.* † The Lord ſaith by the prophet Jeremy, *if my covenant with the day can be made void, and my covenant with the night, that there ſhould not be day and night in their ſeaſon: then may alſo my covenant with David my ſervant be made void, and with the Levites and prieſts my miniſters.* ‡ And by the Prophet Ezekiel, *Thus ſaith the Lord our God: Behold, I will gather the childre.. of Iſrael from the midſt of the nations, and they ſhall no more be two nations; nor ſhall they be defiled any more with their idols. And I will make a covenant of peace with them, it ſhall be an everlaſting covenant with them, and I will eſtabliſh them, and will multiply them, and will ſet my ſanctuary in the midſt of them for ever. And I will be their God, and they ſhall be my people. And the nations ſhall know that I am the Lord, the ſanctifier of Iſrael, when my ſanctuary ſhall be in the midſt of them for ever.* § The prophet Jeremy, after having foretold, that God *would write his law in the hearts* of the new people, that they might not break the covenant, as the Jews had the old one; to ſhew them that this mercy ſhould be continued to them, to the end of the world, he goes on: *Thus ſaith the Lord, who giveth the ſun for the light of the day, the order of the moon and of the ſtars, for the light of the night; who ſtirreth up the ſea, and the waves thereof roar, the Lord of hoſts is his name: If theſe ordinances ſhall fail before me, ſaith the Lord; then alſo the ſeed of Iſrael ſhall fail, ſo as not to be a nation before me for ever.* ‖

---

* Iſ. lix. 20, 21. † Iſ. lxii. 6. ‡ Jer. xxxiii. 20, 21.
§ Ez. xxxvii. 21, 28. ‖ Jer. xxxi. 33, 35, 36.

Q. What do we find in the New Teſtament concerning this ſubject?

A. *The gates of hell*, ſays Jeſus Chriſt, *ſhall not prevail againſt my Church.** *He that does not hear it ſhould be looked on as a heathen.*† *I will aſk the Father and he ſhall give you the Paraclete, the ſpirit of truth, that he may abide with you for ever.*‡ *Behold I am with you all days, even to the conſummation of the world.* §

Q. Did the Apoſtles hold the ſame Doctrine?

A. Saint Paul teaches that the Church *is the pillar and foundation of truth.* ‖ He tells us in his Epiſtle to the Epheſians: that *God hath left Paſtors and Doctors, for the work of the miniſtry, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the edifying of the body of Chriſt: till we all meet into the unity of faith: that henceforth we be no more children toſſed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of Doctrine, by the cunning craftineſs of men, by which they lie in wait to deceive.*¶ The miniſtry of the Church then is what God hath appointed, in order to preſerve men from all uncertainty in regard to Doctrine. It hath hitherto anſwered, and will anſwer this purpoſe to the end of the world.

Q. Have you nothing more to add on this head?

A. I have to notice the words of St. Paul, which follow immediately after thoſe, that I have mentioned. He there repreſents the Church as a body, the members of which, being all united, receive a divine increaſe through its different miniſters, as through ſo many channels, that convey to them the ſpirit of their head, who is Jeſus Chriſt: *From whom the whole body, compacted and fitly joined together, by what every joint ſupplieth, according to the operation in the meaſure of every part, maketh increaſe of the body.*** This ſame com-

---

* Mat. xvi. 18. † Mat. xviii. 17. ‡ John xiv. 16, 17.
§ Mat. xxviii. 20. ‖ 1 Tim. iii. 15. ¶ Eph. iv. 12—14.
** Ibid 16.

pariſon is made by the Apoſtle in his Epiſtle to the Coloſſians. * For which reaſon, no member of the Church can pretend to a communication with Jeſus Chriſt, who is its head, unleſs through the channel of the public miniſtry, which God hath appointed to animate all its members, by the nurture which they impart. Whoever withdraws from theſe channels, and applies elſewhere for nouriſhment, cannot have any vivific junction with Jeſus Chriſt his head, but certainly muſt periſh for want of it. We find Saint Paul, in his Epiſtle to the Epheſians, ſpeaking with no leſs perſpicuity concerning the conſtant vigilance of Jeſus Chriſt, over the faith of his Church, when he ſets before wives the fidelity of his Church, as a pattern of what they owe their huſbands, and when he puts huſbands in mind of the love of Jeſus Chriſt towards his Church, to ſhew with what tenderneſs, they ought to treat their wives. *Let wives*, ſays he, *be ſubject to their huſbands in all things, as the Church is ſubject to Chriſt. Huſbands love your wives, as Chriſt alſo loved the Church, and delivered himſelf up for it: that he might preſent it to himſelf a glorious Church, not having ſpot or wrinkle, nor any ſuch thing, but that it ſhould be holy, and without blemiſh. Every one nouriſheth and cheriſheth his own fleſh, as alſo Chriſt doth the Church.* †

Q. What inference do you draw from all theſe paſſages of the Old and New Teſtament?

A. I gather from them, that whoever accuſes the whole Church of having erred, does not accuſe the Church only, but likewiſe the Apoſtles; he accuſes God himſelf; he accuſes the Father of not having fulfilled his promiſes; he accuſes the Son, that his merits and mediation have ceaſed to be efficacious, and he accuſes the Holy Ghoſt of having neglected the work

* Col. ii. 9. † Eph. v. 24, 29.

committed to him, of always teaching the Church all truth.

Q. Is this obligation, of ſubmitting to the Church, proved by the example of the faithful, as it is by the words of the Holy Scriptures?

A. The example of all the faithful, mentioned in the Holy Scriptures, evinces it: for as it was an eſſential duty, it was incumbent on all the faithful to comply with it. Thus we do not find any mentioned, either in the Old or New Teſtament, who thought themſelves bound to make out their religion, by examining, whether or not all the articles, of which it is compoſed, were grounded upon incontrovertible paſſages of the word of God. So far were they from it, that when the faithful, mentioned in the Holy Scriptures, had diſcovered the authority of the Church, that appeared ſuperior to every other in regard to the fact of religion, nothing more was heard of any diſpute, examination, or even attention to their own private notions: all was ſubmiſſion to higher authority.

Q. Shew how this was the caſe, before the publication of the law of Moſes.

A. The faithful at that time, did not ſettle themſelves in their religion, by a diſcuſſion of the Holy Scriptures, which were not then extant, but they had the teſtimony of the generation, that had given them birth. They believed, without heſitation, what the religion of that time taught them, concerning the origin of the world, the eſſence of God, and what related to his worſhip, as the choice to be made of ſacrifices, of the perſons that were to offer them, of the days on which theſe offerings were to be made, of the commands that regarded their neighbour, &c. They, therefore, who reject the teſtimony of the Church, as, if ſuch was not ſufficient, oppoſe the ways of God himſelf, who, for ſo many ages, ſupplied the faithful with no other mean of coming to a certainty in religion.

Q. Shew us that the faithful ſubmitted to the teſtimony of the Church, in the time of the Old Teſtament, when they were in poſſeſſion of the Holy Scriptures.

A. They then likewiſe obeyed authority, and were not guided by their own examination of particular articles. We do not find that the Iſraelites diſcuſſed every article of religion, which Moſes preſcribed; but being convinced by his miracles, of the certainty of his commiſſion, they, without further examination, believed the articles that he taught, and ſubmitted to the laws, with which he bound them. In after ages, though the reſurrection of the dead, the immortality of the ſoul, the happineſs of heaven, and the pains of hell, were not mentioned in the moſt perſpicuous manner, in the books of Moſes, yet the faithful believed them, on the teſtimony of the Church of Iſrael. They did not object to this teſtimony, that Moſes had been ſilent on thoſe heads, or that he had not ſpoken of them in plain and clear terms, nor did they alledge any other ſuch objection as would probably have occurred to human reaſoning, had they not owned the direction of another guide. God often ſays, that the delivery of the Jews would be the occaſion of the converſion of many people. * It was not neceſſary, that theſe people, on embracing the Jewiſh Religion, ſhould examine and inveſtigate the foundation of every article: they ſaw by this deliverance, which, in itſelf, was miraculous, beſides that it had been long foretold, that the people of Iſrael were the Church of God, and they ſubmitted to its doctrine without any reſerve.

Q. Extend theſe reflexions to the times of the New Teſtament.

A. The Apoſtles in like manner being convinced that the authority of our Lord, in regard to religion, was

---

* Zach. viii. 23. Eſth. viii. 17. Judith xiv. 6. 1 Eſdr. vi. 21.

the moſt reſpectable on the earth, became his diſciples without examining whether the explanation, which he gave of the paſſages of the Old Teſtament, that related to his doctrine, was true or not. They even knew that he concealed ſome part from them, yet their attachment was not diminiſhed on that account.

Q. Continue to prove, from the New Teſtament, that the faithful always followed the rule of ſubmitting to the moſt eminent authority, and not that of examining particular articles.

A. The Jews, who were converted on the day of Pentecoſt, having perceived, by the miraculous gift of tongues, that the authority of the Apoſtles, in religious matters, was the higheſt on earth, ſubmitted without even aſking what particular articles were taught by Chriſtianity, that they might be able to compare them with the Old Teſtament. *Brethren*, ſay they, *what ſhall we do?* * The ſame truth is illuſtrated by the example of the Bereans. They diſcerning, by the miracles, which the Apoſtles wrought, and by thoſe paſſages of the Old Teſtament, which pointed out the Meſſiah in general terms, that the words of the Apoſtles deſerved credit, did not inquire, what were all the particular tenets of Chriſtianity, to ſee, if on examination, they ſhould find them conformable to the Old Teſtament. † The firſt Chriſtians likewiſe ſubjected themſelves to the authority of the Apoſtles, though they knew that they concealed ſeveral myſteries from them, to which they gave the appellation of *ſtrong meat, of the word of perfection.* ‡ St. Paul acted after the ſame manner, when, having been admoniſhed by a viſion from heaven, that he ought to ſubmit himſelf to Ananias, he did not requeſt Ananias to lay before him all the particular articles of Chriſtianity, that he might compare them

---

* Acts 11, 37. † Acts xvii, 7, 12. ‡ Heb 12, 14, & vi. 1.

with the texts of the Old Teſtament, but received with ſubmiſſion, all the words of that holy man, whoſe authority, after what our Lord had revealed to him, was in his regard the higheſt in the world. *

Q. What do you infer from hence?

A. I infer that the example of all the faithful, of whom mention is made in the Holy Scriptures, is a proof, that it is not by an examination of particular articles, that men ought to ſeek the truth, and be determined in their choice of religion, and that every one ought to conſider and look on that authority, which is the moſt eminent in the world, and moſt worthy of belief, that he may afterwards receive all the articles, which it propoſes. In this manner the faithful of all ages having diſcovered, either by reading the Scriptures, or by the marks of which I have ſpoken, that the authority of the Church, in point of religion, was more diſtinguiſhed than any in the world, thought themſelves bound to ſubmit to it, without excepting againſt any point, and did not perſuade themſelves, that they even had a right to compel it to declare all its articles, if it did not think proper; much leſs did they aſſume a title of judging and deciding, by their own examination. On the contrary, they looked on it as an eſſential duty to comply with its preſcriptions, and to adore the will of Jeſus Chriſt, who ſends us to his Church.

Q. Do we find in the Holy Scriptures any other reaſon, which may convince us, that the Apoſtles never taught, that the faithful of ſucceeding ages might diſtruſt the teſtimony of the Church, decide on matters of faith, and determine by way of examination?

A. This is clear from the different commands, which they gave to Paſtors of rejecting heretics, and to particulars of refuſing to hear them. For if there is an obligation of examining, by the Holy Scriptures, the doctrine

* Acts ix. 7, 21.

of every one who takes it into his head to aſſert, that the Church has erred in ſome article of faith, the Apoſtles never would have made prohibitions to the contrary. They would have directed us to hear and examine, with great attention, the reaſons of thoſe who tell us, that we are deceived in our faith. But, inſtead of this, their command is, not to hear ſuch people. *I beſeech you, brethren*, ſays St. Paul, *to mark them, who cauſe diſſentions and offences contrary to the doctrine, which you have learnt, and to avoid them; for by pleaſing ſpeeches and good words, they ſeduce the hearts of the innocent.** *We charge you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, that you withdraw yourſelves from every brother walking diſorderly, and not according to the tradition, which they have received of us.*† *A man that is a heretic, after the firſt and ſecond admonition, avoid. If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the houſe, nor ſay to him, God ſpeed you.*‡ The Apoſtles never would have left theſe commands to Chriſtians of all future ages, if there had been an obligation of noticing and examining all the aſſertions of heretics, or if it had not been lawful to have depended, with an entire confidence, on what was committed to, and depoſited in the Church concerning faith.

Q. Have you nothing more to ſay on this ſubject?

A. I add, that if the Apoſtles had not meant, that we ſhould receive the doctrine of the Church, without any diſtruſt, but that on the contrary we ſhould determine our faith, by an examination of the Holy Scripture only, we ſhould have had writings left to that purpoſe, not only by the four Evangeliſts, by St. Peter, St. Paul, St. James, St. John, St. Jude, but likewiſe by the other Apoſtles. They would all have written for the edification of poſterity, in thoſe countries where they went to

---

* Rom. xvi. 17, 18. † 2 Theſſ. iii. 6. ‡ Tit. iii. 10.

preach the goſpel, unleſs they had been aſſured, that poſterity might rely on the inſtructions of their fore-fathers, in matters of faith; that is, upon what is meant by the teſtimony of the Church. Thoſe Apoſtles, who have written, would not have touched ſo lightly on ſeveral articles of faith, ſuch as, for example, the baptiſm of infants, and the change of the Sabbath into the Sunday. The great and principal care of the Apoſtles was, as we ſee by their writings, to commit matters of faith to faithful perſons, who ſhould deliver them down to others. *The things*, ſays St. Paul to Timothy, *which thou haſt heard of me before many witneſſes, the ſame commend to faithful men, who ſhall be fit to teach others alſo.* *

Q. Having ſhewn in ſo clear a manner from the unſurmountable difficulties, that the unlearned in particular, and all Chriſtians in general would lie under; from the numbers of thoſe who give this teſtimony, which is called the faith of the Church; from expreſs words of the Holy Scriptures, and from the examples of all the faithful that are mentioned in it; having, I ſay, ſhewn from all theſe conſiderations, that there is an indiſpenſable obligation of ſubmitting to the authority of the Church, tell me what particular advantages accrue to the Catholics, from having this truth ſo plainly proved in their favour.

A. There are four principal ones.

Q. Which is the firſt?

A. It is, that they can eaſily diſtinguiſh the true Church; for it appears from thence, that all thoſe, who, in erecting their Church, aſſerted, as the Proteſtants did, that the Church had fallen into damnable errors in faith, were ſeducers, ſince God has rendered it infallible in that regard, and has commanded all Chriſtians to hear it with ſubmiſſion. The true Church is a ſociety in which it never was maintained, that the

* 2 Tim. ii. 2.

Church had apoſtatiſed, or that the gates of hell and damnable errors had prevailed againſt it. All thoſe who, in any age, broached any article of faith contrary to what was then taught in the Church, fell under her cenſures, and drew an anathema upon their own heads. This rule is left by St. Paul for a direction to the end of the world.* Faith is repreſented as a depoſitum, faithfully tranſmitted from hand to hand. Whoever rejects the depoſitum, which he finds in the Church, and pretends to deliver to the ſucceeding generation a doctrine differing from that, which he received from the preceding, has not true faith. *Jeſus Chriſt*, ſays the epiſtle to the Hebrews, *is the ſame yeſterday, and to day, and for ever. Be not led away with various and ſtrange doctrines.* † Whoever to day repreſents Jeſus Chriſt different from what he was repreſented yeſterday, and attempts to inveigle men to embrace a new doctrine, that man is a ſeducer. The true Church then, as I have already ſaid, is a ſociety, the members of which never taught, that the Church had apoſtatiſed, nor ever pretended to teach any thing in regard to faith, that differed from what they had received from the laſt preceding generation in the Church. One would think that this conſideration alone is of ſufficient force, to carry conviction to Proteſtants of their not being the true Church, and of the right which the Catholic Church has to that title.

Q. Which is the ſecond advantage, that Catholics derive from knowing, that the Church cannot err in matters of faith?

A. It is that a Catholic is certain, every moment of his life, that he is not miſtaken in his faith. On the contrary, when any difficulty, in regard to faith, preſents itſelf to the mind of a Proteſtant, who believes that all the viſible Church can err, and acts conform-

* Gal. i. 9. 1 Tim. vi. 20. 2 Tim. i. 13. & ii. 2. † Heb. xiii. 8, 9.

ably to his belief, ſince the proofs which ought to determine him in his examination, cannot occur ſo ſoon to his mind, he ought to doubt whether his examination were made with ſufficient care, as likewiſe whether he be not deceived. But a Catholic, in a ſimilar ſituation, at once ſees his proof, viz. the authority of the Church, which believes the article, againſt which ſome difficulty ſeemed to appear. He immediately ſays to himſelf, I believe what all the faithful believed, and profeſſed, at the time, when ſome innovators ſtarted up, to diſturb the Church on this article. My faith concerning this, is the ſame with that of all Chriſtians, who compoſe the ancient body of the Church, which is ſpread over all the world. It is then the truth. Whatever difficulties may be raiſed, either by the enemies of the Church, or by my own imagination, they give me no diſturbance, my faith is ſecure.

Q. Which is the third advantage, that Catholics receive from the aſſurance given them in the promiſes of God, that the Church will never fall into error?

A. It is that Catholics have a right to quote paſſages of the Holy Scriptures, and to produce arguments, though they ſhould not be expreſſed in the cleareſt terms, and though it ſhould be only probable, that they are in favor of a particular ſubject. They may likewiſe make alluſions, or uſe ſuch other figures as illuſtrate the matter. When we have certain marks of a truth, it is not then forbidden to point out leſs diſtinctive appearances. The certainty of a truth, which we are otherwiſe in poſſeſſion of, gives a right to make the moſt of what ſeems intended to ſupport it, and to preſent the ſame to thoſe, who may be moved by ſuch probable arguments. This practice is obſervable in the ſacred writings, and in the diſcourſes of men of the greateſt wiſdom. So that Proteſtants pay little attention to common maxims, when they upbraid Catholics with producing proofs, which do not carry

with them abſolute conviction. All proofs in the writings of Proteſtants, that are only ſupported by arguments, of themſelves apparently good, ought to be rejected; becauſe, as they have no certainty on their ſide, they have no right to attempt to gain credit, by what has the appearance only of being favorable. Thoſe paſſages, which they quote with moſt confidence, in regard to controverted points, or even articles of faith, that are not controverted, are all ſuch as, on making uſe of ſuch obſervations, (which, all agree, belong to the Holy Scriptures,) are ſuſceptible of different interpretations. One cannot, if one may ſay ſo, find footing amongſt them: I mean, that every part ſtands on a bad foundation. This advantage, in regard to faith, is found only under the authority of the Church.

Q. Which is the fourth advantage that Catholics reap, from the ſecure confidence, that they have in the teſtimony of the Church?

A. It is that they need not be diſturbed, on hearing of a difference of opinion, or diſpute among ſome particular learned men in the Church. Becauſe, as God has commanded us to hear his Church, which he has promiſed ſhall teach all neceſſary truths to the end of the world, we may reſt aſſured, that, if the Church has not defined it, it is not a truth neceſſary to be believed.

Q. Can this ſame principle preſerve the peace of the faithful amid any diſturbances, that may be raiſed by a falſe council?

A. By it all may eaſily diſtinguiſh a falſe council, however numerous it may be, from a lawful one. As they are taught by the Holy Scriptures, that the body of the Church cannot err, they look on thoſe councils as falſe, againſt which it riſes up, and which it accuſes of having betrayed its faith; and admit all thoſe to be genuine, which all the ancient body of the Church receives. Thus, at all times, and on all occaſions, the faith of the Church, which God has pro-

miſed to teach the truth, is the unmoveable rock, on which the faithful ſit ſecure, without apprehenſion from any ſtorm.

CHAP. X.

Continuation of the ſame Subject, in which the principal Objections are anſwered by the Holy Scriptures.

Q. MIGHT it not have happened, that though the faithful, of whom the Church principally conſiſts, had been preſerved from error, according to the promiſe of God; yet that in the mean time the wicked might have got the upper hand, ſo that nothing but hereſy ſhould have been heard from the mouths of the people and their teachers?

A. This is impoſſible, as may be eaſily ſeen, by all that has been ſaid. I need only add here, that ſuch a ſtate of the Church is neither conſiſtent with what the Holy Scriptures ſay of the faithful in particular, nor with what it ſays of the Church in general.

Q. What do the Holy Scriptures ſay of the faithful in particular, that is incompatible with this inviſibility of the Church?

A. The Holy Ghoſt teaches us, that men cannot be faithful even in the greateſt dangers, unleſs they publiſh with their mouths what they believe in their hearts. *With the heart we believe unto juſtice; but with the mouth, confeſſion is made unto ſalvation.* * *Whoſoever ſhall be aſhamed of me, and of my words; the ſon of man alſo ſhall be aſhamed of him, when he ſhall come.* † From hence it appears, that the Chriſtians who, in the time of this

* Rom. x. 10. † Marc. viii. 38.

imaginary inviſibility of the Church, ſhould have diſſembled their faith on ſo many occaſions, as muſt have preſented themſelves of giving teſtimony to it (for example, when they received the ſacrament during their whole lives, and at their deaths,) could by no means have been looked upon as faithful. They muſt be numbered among thoſe *fearful, who ſhall have their portion in the pool burning with fire and brimſtone.* * There never then could be a time, in which the faithful were not known to have made an open profeſſion of their faith. From whence it is certain, that the articles of Proteſtants (which no aſſembly of Chriſtians made profeſſion of believing before the Reformation) cannot be truths revealed by Chriſt.

Q. Do the Holy Scriptures ſay any thing elſe of the faithful, that is irreconcileable with the inviſibility of the Church?

A. *Faith cometh by hearing*, ſaith St. Paul, *and hearing by the word of Chriſt. How ſhall they believe him, of whom they have not heard? and how ſhall they hear without a preacher?* † It is therefore impoſſible, according to the Holy Ghoſt, that Chriſtians could have had true faith in thoſe ſuppoſed times of an inviſible Church, when there was no one to preach the truth.

Q. What do the Holy Scriptures ſay of the Church in general, that is contrary to this notion of inviſibility?

A. The promiſes made to it by the Holy Ghoſt, regard the external as well as the internal part of the Church. In the writings of the Prophets, for example, God does not only promiſe that the Holy Ghoſt will never abandon it, but that the words, which he has put into its mouth, ſhall not depart from thence. ‡ And Our Lord, in the New Teſtament, repreſents the Church, as a ſociety which we muſt always hear, under

---

* Apoc. xxi. 8. † Rom. x. 17, 14. ‡ Iſai. lix. 21.

pain of being looked on as Heathens. After promiſing that the *gates of hell ſhall not prevail againſt it*, he immediately adds, *whatever thou ſhalt bind upon earth, ſhall be bound in heaven*, &c. * To ſhew that this promiſe is addreſſed to a Church, which is viſible by the uſe of the keys, our Lord ſays, *go and teach all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever I have commanded you.* That we may know that it is to a Church, which is viſible by the preaching of his word, and the adminiſtration of his ſacraments, that he promiſes the preſence of his grace, he adds: *behold I am with you all days, even to the conſummation of the world.* † And St. Paul informs us, that the employment of the Paſtors of the Church ſhall be *to perfect the ſaints, to edify the body of Chriſt till we all meet into the unity of faith.* ‡ The Church then muſt always be viſible, by preaching the truth, and by a lawful adminiſtration of the ſacraments.

Q. Notwithſtanding what you have ſaid, Elias thought that he alone remained faithful to God, and was ignorant, that God had preſerved ſeveral thouſands from the ſtain of infidelity: for he ſays to God, *I alone am left.* And God anſwers, *I have left me ſeven thouſand men in Iſrael, whoſe knees have not been bowed before Baal.* § We ſhould not then be ſurpriſed to hear Proteſtants ſay, that in the ages which preceded the reformation, God had reſerved ſeveral thouſand faithful undiſcovered.

A. Elias did not mean that he alone continued faithful, but that he only eſcaped the fury of Jezabel. This is manifeſt from his words: *I only*, ſays he to the people, *remain a prophet of the Lord: but the prophets of Baal are four hundred and fifty men.* ¶ *They have*, ſays

---

* Mat. xvi. 18, 19. † Mat. xxviii. 19, 20, ‡ Eph. iv. 12, 13.
§ 1 Kings xix. 10, 14, 18. ¶ 1 Kings xviii. 22.

he to God, *thrown down thy altars, they have ſlain thy prophets with the ſword, and I alone am left, and they ſeek my life to take it away.** And if God ſays to him, *I have left me, &c.* it is not by way of information, as if he had not known that there were more faithful; but by way of comfort, through the conſideration of ſo many Iſraelites, who perſevered in their allegiance to God, notwithſtanding the martyrdom of the Prophets their teachers. We may add, that inſtead of tranſlating this paſſage; *I have left ſeven thouſand men,* it may have a future ſignification, as, *I will leave me, &c.* In this light, it will be ſeen that God, in this place, comforts the prophet Elias for the calamities, which he had revealed to him, Jehu, and in particular Hazael, king of Syria, would bring upon that country, † and that he here gives him a promiſe of preſerving the Iſraelites, who remained faithful, from the evils, which ſhould fall only on the Idolaters.

Q. Though this paſſage ſhould prove, that Elias believed that he alone was faithful; can the Proteſtants gather from this example of the faithful, who were hidden and unknown to this Prophet, that there might have been many faithful concealed during all that time, in which they imagine the whole viſible Church was drowned in Idolatry?

A. Not at all: for theſe complaints of the Prophet Elias extend only to the perſecution of Achab, which was of ſhort duration. Now the difference is very material between ſaying, that ſome faithful may be concealed for a very ſhort while, and aſſerting with Proteſtants, that, during many ages, numbers were concealed in the boſom of the Roman Church. In the firſt caſe, the faithful had been inſtructed in their faith by the public miniſters, before the perſecution broke out; and they only hid themſelves in expectation of

* 1 Kings xix. 14. † 1 Kings xix. 16, 17.

being able, in a ſhort time to make an open profeſſion of their faith. But in the latter caſe, it can never be conceived either, where theſe concealed faithful had learned their faith, nor how it was lawful for them to paſs their whole lives without giving the leaſt mark of it, notwithſtanding all the occaſions, that muſt have occurred.

Q. Is this all, that the Holy Scriptures furniſh us with, on this ſubject?

A. We find there a much more conſiderable difference. The word of God ſpeaks there of only a part of the Church, and of that part of the Church in which the greater number of the members had fallen into ſchiſm, that is, the kingdom of the ten tribes. The Holy Scriptures teach us, that the Church was ſo far from being inviſible, that it was then in great proſperity. The pious king Joſaphat, who reigned at that time in Jeruſalem, and whoſe army conſiſted of above eleven hundred thouſand men, left nothing undone, that might contribute to the encouragement of religion in his dominions. No one doubts, but that the faithful may occaſionally be under the neceſſity of concealing themſelves in ſome particular part of the world; but it would be ſtrange to conclude from thence, that the faithful throughout the whole world, can be ſo concealed, that the true Church ſhould not be any where viſible.

Q. The Church of Iſrael frequently fell into idolatry, as appears from ſeveral paſſages of the Old Teſtament: how then can it be ſaid that it never could have happened, that the Chriſtian Church ſhould either have taught or been guilty of idolatry?

A. In the firſt place, I anſwer in general to ſuch paſſages, that the Holy Scriptures do not allow us to make a compariſon betwixt the Church of Iſrael and the Chriſtian Church in this point.

Q. Why not?

A. The Chriſtian Church, according to the prediction

of the Holy Ghoſt, is ſpread over all the parts of the world. Hence there is a much greater impoſſibility of an univerſal corruption in it, than in the Church of Iſrael, which was confined to a ſmall nation.

Q. Give ſome other reaſons that will not permit a compariſon betwixt the Chriſtian Church, and that of Iſrael, in regard to the ſubject of idolatry.

A. *The new covenant*, as St. Paul informs us, *is eſtabliſhed on better promiſes than the old.* * God did not make an abſolute promiſe without any reſerve to the old Church, as he did to the new, that, *the gates of hell ſhould not prevail againſt it*, † and that *the ſpirit of truth ſhould abide with it for ever.* ‡ And this is what, according to Jeremy and St. Paul, makes the great difference betwixt the old and the new covenant, viz. that the Jews had not kept their covenant with fidelity, but that the new people ſhould always continue faithful to theirs. For when the ancient Fathers prove, that the new covenant is better, and founded on better promiſes than the old, they do not fail to quote that paſſage of Jeremy, where he ſays: *Behold the days ſhall come, ſaith the Lord, and I will make a new covenant with the houſe of Iſrael, and with the houſe of Juda: not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt: the covenant which they made void, and I had dominion over them, ſaith the Lord. But this ſhall be the covenant, that I will make with the houſe of Iſrael after thoſe days, ſaith the Lord: I will give my law in their bowels, and will write it in their heart: and I will be their God, and they ſhall be my people.* §

Q. Is this all that you intend to ſay of the compariſon, which the Proteſtants make of the Chriſtian Church and that of Iſrael, in regard to idolatry?

---

* Heb. viii. 6. † Mat. xvi. 18. ‡ Jo. xiv. 16. & xvii. 17.
§ Jerem. xxxi. 31. & Heb. viii. 8.

A. I add, that God was ſo far from giving the Church of Iſrael a promiſe, that it ſhould not fall into idolatry, that he even foretold that this ſhould happen. *Behold thou ſhalt ſleep with thy fathers*, ſaid God to Moſes; *and this people riſing up, will go a whoring after ſtrange Gods in the land, to which it goeth in to dwell: there will they forſake me, and will make void the covenant which I have made with them. I know*, ſaid Moſes to them, *after my death, you will do wickedly, and will quickly turn aſide from the way that I have commanded you.** Moſes even left them a prophetic Canticle, in which he foretold this fall of the people into idolatry.† So that their inaccuracy, in examining the Holy Scriptures, is very palpable, who compare the Church of Iſrael, and the Chriſtian Church, in the point of Idolatry; as it was expreſsly foretold, that the former ſhould fall into idolatry; and no leſs ſo, that the latter ſhould not.

Q. That we may more diſtinctly perceive this difference, point out thoſe paſſages, which expreſsly foretel that the Chriſtian Church is never to be infected by idolatry, without repeating thoſe, which you have already quoted on this ſubject.

A. There is as manifeſt a promiſe in the word of God, that the Chriſtian Church would never become idolatrous, as there is a prediction, that this ſhould be the caſe of the Jewiſh people. Iſaias, ſpeaking of the converſion of nations, under the New Teſtament, tells us, that the *idols ſhould be utterly deſtroyed.* ‡ *The Gods*, ſays Jeremy, *that have not made heaven and earth, let them periſh from the earth, and from among theſe things, that are under heaven.* § *They ſhall no more be divided into two kingdoms*, ſays Ezechiel, *nor ſhall they be defiled any more with their idols, nor with their abominations.* ‖ Micheas, in like manner, having predicted the birth of

---

* Deut. xxxi. 16 29. † Deut. xxxii. 5. 15. 16. ‡ Iſai. ii. 18
§ Jerem. x. 11. ‖ Ez. xxxvii. 22. 23.

the Meſſiah, immediately adds, on the part of God: *I will deſtroy thy graven things, and thy ſtatues, out of the midſt of thee: and thou ſhalt no more adore the works of thy hands.** The ſame propheſy is found in Zachary.† Thus the Scriptures having foretold, that the people of Iſrael ſhould become idolatrous, and that idolatry never ſhould be known in the Chriſtian Church, whoſoever pretends to prove that the latter may have embraced idolatry, becauſe this happened to the former, does moſt certainly contradict the Word of God.

Q. Have you any thing more to add on this ſubject?

A. I ſay, that the idolatry of the Jewiſh people ſhould make us infer, that the Chriſtian Church would never fall into idolatry. Moſes, on the point of death, foretold the idolatry of the Jews, and it happened accordingly. Our Lord foretold, before he left this earth, that he would be with the Chriſtian Church to the end of the world, and conſequently would preſerve it from idolatry; whence we muſt neceſſarily conclude, that he has fulfilled his promiſe, has cheriſhed his Church with his grace, and never left it in darkneſs, nor given it up to the profanations of idolatry.

A. Can you oppoſe any other reflection to the argument, which Proteſtants pretend to form from the ſeveral idolatries of the Jews, in confirmation of their notions concerning the ſtate of the Church before their reformation?

A. What has been ſaid already might ſuffice on this head. But it is eaſy to let them ſee, that though the Chriſtian ſhould not have had any particular privilege above the Jewiſh Church in this point, yet all that is ſaid of the idolatry of the Jews, in the Old Teſtament, never could evince the poſſibility of that ſtate of idolatry, in which they imagine, the Church was before their Re-

---

* Mich. v. 2. 12. † Zach. xiii. 2.

formation. For certainly we do not find, in the Old Teſtament, that this idolatry was univerſal, that it continued ſeveral ages without oppoſition, that it was unanimouſly charged upon the miniſters of God. In ſhort, we do not find, that it was of the ſame nature, or publicity, as that, which they do not heſitate to aſcribe to the Chriſtian Church.

Q. Say ſomething in particular concerning the idolatry of the molten calf, which is ſo frequently adduced, in ſupport of the poſſibility of that idolatry, which they lay to the charge of the whole viſible Church, before their Reformation. We read in the book of Exodus, that the Iſraelites *offered holocauſts and peace-victims to the golden calf, and that the people ſat down to eat and drink, and they roſe up to play.** Here is an idolatrous feſtival obſerved by all the tribes of the Church of Iſrael.

A. This idolatry of the Jews, and that of which Proteſtants accuſe the Church, differ very widely both in regard to their duration, and their univerſality.

Q. What is the difference in regard to their duration?

A. The Holy ſcriptures repreſent this idolatrous feſtival of the calf, as continuing only one day: for, on the ſame day, Moſes returns, and puts a ſtop to theſe abominations. But the Reformers maintained that, during the ſpace of many ages, the Church was involved in ſeveral ſpecies of Idolatry.

Q. Explain the other difference, which relates to the univerſality.

A. I affirm that it is not true, that the whole Church of Iſrael ever was at any time guilty of idolatry. The words of the book of Exodus are not to be taken in the moſt rigorous ſenſe, as if all the Iſraelites had profeſſed themſelves adorers of the golden calf, as all the Catholics muſt have profeſſed themſelves of other objects of

* Ex. xxxii. 6.

idolatry, if the accuſations of the Proteſtants be true. This is ſo far from being the caſe, that many interpreters have undertaken to prove from Exodus, that Aaron was not chargeable with any guilt in the adoration of the golden calf; that all the ſteps he took were ſo many proteſtations againſt the idolatry of this people, whoſe rage he thought could not be repreſſed by any other means, before Moſes ſhould return; and that the greateſt part of the people were not partakers in this ſin.* Theſe interpreters charge the idolatry on a crowd of Egyptians, who had followed them, and on a part only of the Iſraelites. The Holy Ghoſt gives teſtimony, that the tribe of Levi preſerved its fidelity to God. For which reaſon Moſes armed them to be the avengers of the crime of thoſe, who had fallen.† The ſame anſwer is applicable to other paſſages of the Old Teſtament, which ſeem to point out an univerſal defection. The reprimand, (by a figure that is common among preachers) is directed to all, that the impreſſion may be deeper, on the minds of the guilty. Thus the Holy Ghoſt having told us in general terms, that, in the time of Roboam, *all Iſrael ſinned with him*, informs us, in the ſame chapter, that the good works, that were performed among the people, averted their deſtruction.‡ Though idolatry was as univerſal under the reign of Achaz, as under any of the other idolatrous kings, yet there were many faithful at that time. This is manifeſt, both from the oppoſition made by the people to the *receiving of that prince into the ſepulchres of the Kings of Iſrael*, § and their readineſs to return to the ſervice of God, under the reign of Ezechias, ſon of Achaz. The ſame obſervation may be made on the book of Judges, that many preſerved their fidelity, though idolatry be there noticed as the ſin of all the people. The Holy Ghoſt himſelf

---

* Theodoret. on Exod. queſ. 66. and fol. † Exod. xxxii. 26. 29.
‡ 2 Chron. xii. 1. 2. and 12. § 2 Chron. xxviii. 27.

reſtrains thoſe general terms, which ſeem to qualify the idolatry of the golden calf as univerſal. *Neither become ye*, ſays he, *idolaters as ſome of them: as it is written: the people ſat down*, &c.* Thus we ought to judge in general of thoſe times, that though the corruption is repreſented as general, yet many made open profeſſion of adoring God only, and ſerved him with great fidelity.

Q. Do you make any other remark on the difference between the idolatry of the golden calf, and that, with which the Catholic Church is accuſed?

A. I obſerve that our principal diſpute with Proteſtants, concerning the infallibility of the Church, relates to the teſtimonies, which it gives of its faith, and to the practices, which are authoriſed by theſe teſtimonies. Now it is indiſputable, that the conduct of thoſe, who adored the golden calf, how numerous ſoever they may have been, was not countenanced by any teſtimony of the Church of Iſrael, but was directly contrary to it. The Iſraelites neither believed, nor pretended to aſſert, that the Lord had commanded Moſes to introduce this worſhip of the calf, nor that Moſes had ever publiſhed it in any aſſembly of the people. So far from it, they even knew, that the adoration of all idols was prohibited by the law of Moſes. This example then is foreign to the queſtion of the infallibility of the Church, and cannot be a juſtification of the raſhneſs of the Reformers, in condemning thoſe practices, of which the Church ſays; *ſhe has received them from the Apoſtles, and hath delivered them to the faithful of all ages, from the firſt preaching of the Goſpel to the preſent time.* This is the teſtimony which we maintain never was, nor will be given on the ſide, either of hereſy, or of any other unlawful worſhip.

Q. Is not this anſwer applicable to the other parts of

* 1 Cor. x. 7.

the Old Teſtament, in which mention is made of the reign of idolatry among the Jews, and which Proteſtants lay hold of as proofs, that the Church may have been ſunk in idolatry?

A. It is thoroughly ſo. Though it could be made out, (which in reality is impoſſible,) that the paſſages which repreſent idolatry as the crime of all the Jews, ought to be literally underſtood; yet they could not be pertinently introduced into the preſent controverſy, as they tend only to prove the exiſtence of a certain practice among the Jews, which was unſupported by any teſtimony of their Church in its favor. We do not find, in any of theſe paſſages, that the Jewiſh people ever aſſerted, that Moſes, whoſe divine miſſion was atteſted by numberleſs miracles, had taught their fathers the worſhip of Baal; nor that, from the ſame fathers, it had deſcended in an uninterrupted ſucceſſion down to them. The Jews did not pretend to ground this idolatrous worſhip on a traditional teſtimony, which, by evincing the certainty of public facts, that bore relation to it, might ſhew its origin was from heaven. The example of neighbouring nations, their own afflictions, and the ſucceſs of thoſe, who ſerved idols, were their only inducements to it. For this reaſon, God commanded Moſes to charge them never to ſay: *As theſe nations have worſhiped their gods, ſo will I alſo worſhip.* * *The gods of the Kings of Syria*, ſaid Achaz, *help them, and I will appeaſe them with victims, and they will help me.* † *We will ſacrifice to the queen of heaven*, ſaid the Jews in Jeremy, *as we have done, and we were filled with bread, and it was well with us, and we ſaw no evil. But ſince we left off to offer ſacrifice to the queen of heaven, we have wanted all things, and have been conſumed by the ſword, and by famine.* ‡ *I will go after my lovers*, ſaid this ſame nation, in the prophet Oſee, *that give me my bread, and*

* Deut. xii. 30. † 2 Par. xxviii. 23. ‡ Jer. xliv. 17.

*my water, my wool, and my flax, my oil, and my drink.** *Let us go,* ſaid the wicked Jews, in the times of the Machabees, *and make a covenant with the heathens: for ſince we departed from them, many evils have befallen us.*† Theſe were the reaſons, which made them embrace idolatry. But they never pretended to ſay, that it was authoriſed by the conſtant teſtimony of all preceding generations, the firſt of which had received it by a manifeſt revelation from heaven. Yet this ſhould be found in the hiſtory of the Jewiſh idolatry, before Proteſtants can draw any argument from it, to ſhew that idolatry may be taught in ſome articles of the Catholic Church. Theſe articles were ſupported by the teſtimony of the viſible Church, when the reformers began their work. It ſaid then concerning them: *The Apoſtles taught all the Church of their time theſe articles; the Church taught the next generation; and thus the preſent generation has received them, confirmed by the uninterrupted teſtimony of all foregoing generations.* Nothing of this kind ever came from the mouth of the viſible Church, either in defence of idolatry, or of herefy.

Q. The Proteſtants then cannot find any thing in the Jewiſh idolatry, on which they may ground their accuſations of idolatry againſt the Church?

A. They may more eaſily diſcover the contrary. For as there was no error in the teſtimonies given, by every generation of the Jews, to the doctrine of Moſes, and ſuch practices were corrupt, that had no ſuch teſtimony on their ſide; ſo the teſtimony of the Chriſtian Church will never favor idolatry or hereſy. Otherwiſe the preſervation of the Chriſtian Church would be worſe ſecured than that of the Jewiſh. This, as I have already remarked, is contrary to the promiſes of God, as well as to the dictates of reaſon; for ſuch a change in the teſtimony of nations, is much leſs conceivable in the

* Oſee ii. 5. † 1 Mach. i. 12.

vaſt extent of the Chriſtian, than in the more limited boundaries of the Jewiſh Church.

Q. It is foretold that *all the earth ſhould be in admiration after the beaſt, and take its character.*

A. We are not told in any part of the Scriptures, that the viſible Church would be this beaſt: the paſſages already quoted muſt evince, that this ſtrange alteration can never take place.

Q. What do you underſtand by this beaſt mentioned in the Apocalypſe?

A. I underſtand the Pagan Roman Empire, which, as St. John foretold, perſecuted the Church, during the three firſt ages. * This is the Empire, which the devil ſtirred up, to drive the Chriſtian Church into the wilderneſs, whither her children fled to avoid the fury of the idolatrous Magiſtrates. This is the Tyrant, whoſe name, number, or character, that is, whoſe ſlave every one was to be, that either bought or ſold. † This is the beaſt, that executed its power by the heathen prieſts, who were that other beaſt, which had horns like a lamb, and ſpoke as a dragon; ‡ that is to ſay, which attempted to imitate Jeſus Chriſt in the miracles and predictions of his Apoſtles. This is the beaſt, that was to be killed and eaten by the kings, that had been ſubject to it. Thus, by the earth's admiration of the beaſt, is meant the power and proſperity of Pagan idolatry in the firſt ages, and not an univerſal corruption of the viſible church, which is contrary to the words of Jeſus Chriſt.

Q. If we are bound to ſubmit to all that the Church teaches, David would not have ſaid *every man is a liar.* §

A. I have already anſwered this objection in part, yet will add here, that though this character may agree with all men, if we conſider the weakneſs only of their

---

* Apoc. xii. 6. 14. † Ibid. xiii. 16. 17. ‡ Ibid xi. 12.
§ Pſ. cxv. 2.

natural inclinations, nevertheleſs the ſame cannot be ſaid, if we view them in the hands of God, and under the direction of his Holy Spirit. So the firſt Chriſtians were bound to believe the Apoſtles, though they were not more than men, and we in our turn muſt ſubmit to the Church, though it be a body compoſed of men. We may likewiſe obſerve how this paſſage is diſtorted by Proteſtants; for it is not even a proof of that want of ſincerity, which is ſo natural to mankind, but might rather be applied to the fault, of which the Proteſtants are guilty, on this very ſubject. For when the royal prophet ſaid, *every man is a liar*, God had then left him to his own thoughts, to make him ſenſible of his weakneſs. Beholding, whilſt in this ſtate, the proſperity of the wicked, and the ſufferings of the good, he diſputed the truth of the word of the Prophets, and particularly of Samuel, who had foretold to him on the part of God, that he ſhould be king of Iſrael. David returning to himſelf, and being convinced by his own reſcue, that no deceit proceeds from the mouth of thoſe, who are under the direction of the Holy Spirit, he ſues to God for the pardon of his temerity: *I was*, ſays he, *in great affliction, when I ſaid every man is a liar.* * Thoſe, in like manner, who have at any time charged errors on the Church, which, we are ſo frequently told in the Scripture, is under the direction of the Holy Spirit, ought, if they hearken to the inſtructions of this paſſage, to entreat God to forgive them their crime.

Q. The word of God ſays, *ſearch the Scriptures*, and commends the Bereans for ſearching them, to find out the texts alledged by the Apoſtles. † It would not give us theſe inſtructions, if we could rely on the authority of the Church.

A. The ſame Scripture, that admoniſhes us to read the word of God, preſcribes obedience to the Church:

---

* Pſ. cxv. 2. † Jo. v. 39. Act. xvii. 11.

If it ſays, *The holy men of God ſpoke, inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt,* * it ſays likewiſe of the Church, *he ſhall give you the ſpirit of truth, that he may abide with you for ever.* † If it ſays, *ſearch the Scriptures,* it ſays likewiſe, *if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee, as the heathen and the publican.* ‡ If we find in it, that *Scripture is profitable to inſtruct,* we likewiſe find, *that our Lord left Paſtors and Doctors, for the work of the miniſtry, for the edifying of the body of Chriſt.* § Thus as the Holy Scriptures recommend both theſe things, we muſt obſerve them both; that is to ſay, we muſt read the word of God, and ſubmit to the Church, and not imitate the firſt Reformers, who read indeed the Scriptures, but refuſed to hearken to the Church. Catholics alone can be ſaid, to comply with theſe duties, and to preſerve at once the dignity of the Scriptures, and the authority of the Church.

Q. Have you any thing more to ſay on this ſubject?

A. I obſerve that as the Holy Ghoſt foreſaw the reſiſtance, that would be made to the authority of the Church; ſubmiſſion to the Church is more frequently recommended in the Holy Scriptures, than the reading of the word of God.

CHAP. XI.

Of the Viſibility of the Church.

Q. THOUGH moſt of the paſſages, that you have already mentioned, ſpeaking of the infallibility and other true marks of the Church, are likewiſe proofs of its viſibility, favor us nevertheleſs with ſomething particular on this article.

* 2 Pet. i. 21. † Jo. xiv. 16. ‡ Mat. xviii. 17. § Eph. iv. 11. 12.

A. Viſibility is a mark ſo eſſential to the Church, that whatever calls it in queſtion, attempts to rob it of the faireſt promiſes made to it by Jeſus Chriſt in the Holy Scriptures.

Q. Point out ſome parts of the Holy Scriptures, which make the viſibility of the Church incontrovertible.

A. The Prophet Iſaias repreſents the Catholic Church as a moſt high mountain, expoſed to the view of all the world: *In the laſt days*, ſays he, *the mountain of the houſe of the Lord ſhall be prepared, on the top of mountains, and it ſhall be exalted above the hills: and all nations ſhall flow unto it.* * This houſe of the Lord is the Church, which is elevated as a mountain, becauſe it was to be viſible to all men, and in all ages. The ſame mark of the Church is given by the Prophet Micheas. For theſe two Prophets, declaring its viſibility, tell us, that it is not only a mountain, but a mountain raiſed upon the top of mountains, that all nations may behold it. Accordingly exhorting each other to aſcend to it: *Come*, ſay they, *let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, and to the houſe of the God of Jacob.* † Now it is evident, that nations could not encourage each other to mount up to the Church, ſo frequently prefigured to us in the Old Teſtament by a high mountain, unleſs it was viſible.

Q. Cannot you corroborate this viſibility of the Church, by ſome paſſage of the New Teſtament?

A. We find, that when Jeſus Chriſt inſtructs us, in what manner we ought to comport ourſelves, in regard to our brethren, he tells us, if they offend us, firſt to admoniſh them in private, then to take two or three witneſſes, and if they will not hear them, to tell the Church, and if they will not hear the Church, to look on them as heathens and publicans. ‡

Q. How does this ſtrengthen your aſſertion?

---

* Iſai. ii. 2. † Mich. iv. 1. 2. ‡ Mat. xviii. 15. 17.

A. There are here two commands laid on all Chriſtians, one of denouncing the obſtinate to the Church, and another of ſubmitting to the ſentence, which it pronounces in order to bring back the refractory to their duty. Neither of theſe precepts can be complied with, in the ſuppoſition that the Church is inviſible: for who can give information to an inviſible authority, or how can an inviſible judge decide?

Q. Produce ſome other part of the Goſpel.

A. Jeſus Chriſt ſays to his Apoſtles and their ſucceſſors: *Go ye and teach all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, teaching them to obſerve all things, whatſoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days, even to the conſummation of the world.** Hence it is manifeſt, that Jeſus Chriſt gave a promiſe to his Apoſtles, that they ſhould be ſucceeded by Paſtors and Teachers to the end of time; that the miniſtry of the word, the adminiſtration of the ſacraments, and the appointed form of government ſhould laſt, as long as the world exiſted; and that there ſhould always be a Church, in which Jeſus Chriſt would remain for ever, and which would inſtruct, preach, baptize and obſerve all, that he had commanded his Apoſtles. Now theſe things could not be practiſed, if the Church were at any time inviſible; nor can this viſibility be ever doubted of, without annulling the promiſe, which Jeſus Chriſt made of remaining with it to the end of the world.

Q. If the Church is viſible, it muſt be compoſed of a ſociety of good and bad, who make an outward profeſſion of one Religion, under the conduct of its Paſtors. Now this cannot be the Church, which the word of God deſcribes; for we ſee there, that the Church is the ſpouſe of Jeſus Chriſt,† which he loved ſo tenderly, that *he delivered himſelf up for it: that he might ſanctify*

* Mat. xxviii. 19. 20. † Pſ. xliv. 11. 18.

it, cleanſing it by the laver of water in the word of life; that he might preſent it to himſelf a glorious Church, not having ſpot or wrinkle, nor any ſuch thing, but that it ſhould be holy, and without blemiſh. * But the ſociety, which you call the Church, is full of wrinkles and ſpots, and corrupted both in its members, who are infected with many crimes and ſins, in its Paſtors, many of whom lead unedifying lives, and in its Doctrine, which is mixed with human traditions. Should not we then ſay, that the Church is compoſed of a ſmall number of Elect, who follow the pure word of God, and conſequently that the Church, which you pretend is viſible, is not the true Church?

A. All Catholics allow and declare, that the Church is the ſpouſe of Jeſus Chriſt, that it is holy and without blemiſh, and that it neither hath ſpot, nor wrinkle, nor any ſuch thing in its *doctrine*, which is ſtrictly conformable to the pure word of God, not indeed as it is explained by every individual, ſince we are taught by St. Peter, that *no prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation;* † but as it is explained by the Holy Fathers, and accepted by the unanimous conſent of the univerſal Church. If individuals have invented new doctrines, either againſt faith or morals, ſuch human traditions can never boaſt of its approbation. Nor do the crimes or irregularities of any of its Paſtors or Children ever receive any encouragement from it: it grieves, and is afflicted at the ſight of them, it conſiders them as rotten members, or weeds, that cannot be ſeparated before the harveſt, leſt the good corn ſhould be rooted up together with them. And are we not taught by Jeſus Chriſt, in the Goſpel, that the Church is a kingdom, in which there are both wiſe and fooliſh virgins, ‡ and that ſcandals will come? It is compared to a field ſown with good ſeed, that is afterwards ſown with

* Epheſ. v. 25. 27. † 2 Pet. i. 20. ‡ Mat. xxv. 1.

cockle by the enemy,* to a net caſt into the ſea, and filled with all kind of fiſhes,† and to a barn floor, on which the chaff is mixed with the wheat‡. It is then an unſufferable raſhneſs in any individual, to attempt to ſeparate the chaff from the corn before the time, and through an indiſcreet zeal and a diſobedient ſpirit, to root up the weeds in the field of the Church, before the harveſt, contrary to the commands of the maſter of the family. There are then both good and bad in the Church, but with this difference, that the good are not only members of the Church, but are animated with its ſpirit, which is charity, and are living members of the body, the head of which is Jeſus Chriſt; while the wicked, though they belong to the external body of the church, ſince they believe its articles and doctrine, and have been ſpiritually regenerated in it by baptiſm, are yet no more than languid and dead members, ſince they are ſtript of charity, which is the life of it. It is certain then, that the church is that city, which, being built on a mountain, neither can be hid nor inviſible. §

CHAP. XII.

Of the Word of God.

Q. WHY do you ſay, that only the Catholic Church can maintain the rights and dignity of the Scriptures?

A. Becauſe there are no other principles, except thoſe of the Catholics, by which any one can clearly point them out.

Q. To begin with the firſt and principal, which is its ſacred origin, explain how what you have advanced, is

* Mat. xiii. 24. † Ibid. xlvii. ‡ Luke iii. 17. § Mat. v. 14.

applicable to the divine inſpiration of the Holy Scriptures.

A. It is eaſy for Catholics to know, that the Scriptures are divinely inſpired, ſince they profeſs to rely with ſecurity on the teſtimony of the Church, which atteſts that theſe books were publiſhed by men, whoſe heavenly miſſion was confirmed by numerous miracles, that it received them from their hands, and that it has in all ages given public teſtimony to their divine origin. But as for Proteſtants, whoſe profeſſion is, that ſuch teſtimony is not to be truſted to, they have deprived themſelves of this mean, which God had left, of making his word known, and therefore cannot have a full aſſurance of the inſpiration of the ſacred writings. Hence, ſo far from reforming, they have ſubverted the foundations of religion.

Q. They ſay, they know the Holy Scripture by the marks of inſpiration, which they find in it.

A. Theſe marks are not ſufficient to convey full conviction of the divine origin of theſe ſacred books. For it is very plain, that after the moſt attentive and accurate peruſal of many of theſe books, as of the Cantick of Canticles, Eccleſiaſtes, Ruth, and Eſther, we cannot diſcover any thing in them, by which we may be fully aſſured, that they could not have been penned by an uninſpired writer. Thus we ſee, that Proteſtants, who have no longer any principle to direct them to the diſcovery of the inſpiration of theſe ſacred writings, have preſerved ſome, and rejected others, as caprice or paſſion inſpired the leaders of the reformation. The Calviniſts have rejected ſeveral books of the Old Teſtament, as that of Wiſdom, Eccleſiaſticus, and the Machabees, while many Lutherans have carried matters ſo far as to throw out ſome of the New, as the epiſtle to the Hebrews, thoſe of St. James, and St. Jude, the ſecond of St. Peter, the ſecond and third of St. John, and the Apocalypſe. And as to thoſe which they have kept,

they receive them as divinely inſpired, without having any certain principle to point out this inſpiration.

Q. Have you any thing more to add concerning theſe marks, which Proteſtants pretend to be ſufficient, to bring them to a certain knowledge of the divine origin of theſe ſacred books?

A. I ſay, that ſtrictly ſpeaking, theſe marks are directions only to Catholics. The principles of Proteſtants ſet them aſide.

Q. Why do you ſay, that the principles of Proteſtants render theſe marks of inſpiration, which are found in the Holy Scriptures, undiſcernible to them, and that they are only viſible to Catholics?

A. This is occaſioned by their miſtruſt of the teſtimony of the Church; and by their perſuaſion, that no certainty of any thing relating to faith can be acquired, except from the Holy Scriptures. The prophecies, for example, are one of the principal indications of the divine origin of the Scriptures: but they are not ſo, unleſs the time of the prophecy be known, as the moſt ſtriking part of them is the ſpace, that intervenes betwixt their promulgation and completion. This mark is immediately diſcovered by Catholics, who, truſting to the teſtimony of the Church, are convinced, that the books, which contain theſe predictions, were written long before their accompliſhment. This is undiſcernible to Proteſtants, who making profeſſion, that they cannot find any certain grounds for any thing, that regards religion, except in the word of God, have nothing that can lead them to a clear diſcovery of the date or time of theſe predictions.

Q. Shew the truth of this obſervation, when applied to ſome other mark of the divine origin of the Holy Scriptures.

A. Another principal mark is the agreement of all the different parts, without any contradiction. This character makes a due impreſſion on a Catholic, who depends on the authority of the Church, which teaches

him the eſteem he ought to have for this book. Whenever he is at a loſs how to reconcile, in a clear and perſpicuous manner, thoſe paſſages, that appear contradictory, he, with humility, attributes this difficulty to the weakneſs of his own underſtanding. This is not the caſe with Proteſtants, who take up the Holy Scripture to examine whether they can diſcover any marks of its divine authority. As to the ignorant, who make up the greateſt part of their ſociety, there are numerous parts, relating both to doctrine and hiſtory, which they cannot pretend to reconcile. Even the moſt learned among them are perplexed, when they attempt to conciliate ſeveral paſſages, ſuch as ſome, which occur in the books of Kings and Chronicles. Thus, for want of confidence in the teſtimony of the Church, both the one and the other meet with ſtumbling-blocks, becauſe they cannot aſcertain whether theſe apparent contradictions be real, or only apparent. For which reaſon, the agreement of theſe holy books cannot be, in their regard, a certain mark of their divine origin.

Q. Proceed in the proofs of your aſſertion.

A. The miracles, the ſtyle, the ſublimity of the myſteries, the effects, which the Holy Scripture operates in the hearts of its readers, are likewiſe characteriſtics of this divine word. Theſe make that impreſſion on the minds of Catholics, for which God intended them. Being previouſly convinced, by the teſtimony of the Church, that God ſpeaks to them by theſe holy books, they are more deeply penetrated by the words they read. For, it is certain, that we are not affected in the ſame manner by the words of man, as by thoſe, which come from the Creator of heaven and earth, the King of the heavenly hoſts, who can raiſe us up to heaven, or conſign us, in an inſtant, to the endleſs torments of hell. In ſuch a preparation of mind, we eaſily ſuppreſs all oppoſition, that may ariſe from our own received ideas, if any thing appear ſtrange, either in the miracles related, or in the manner of expreſſion, or in the doctrine

of incomprehenſible myſteries. Such a preparation of mind prevents all contrariety of opinion, exalts the ſoul into an admiration of other parts of the Holy Scriptures, which would not affect it in ſo lively a manner, if it were in different diſpoſitions.

What is the reaſon theſe characteriſtics make not the ſame impreſſion on the minds of Proteſtants?

A. I do not ſay, the ſame impreſſions are not made on their minds: for it is certain, that contrary to, or unmindful of their principles, they read the Holy Scripture, as we do, with a mind prepoſſeſſed in its favor, ſo that ſimilar impreſſions are obſervable in them. But, ſtrictly ſpeaking, theſe characteriſtics ſhould not be ſuch to them; for if Proteſtants adhered to their own principles, they could not feel theſe impreſſions in their hearts.

Q. Why ſo?

A. Becauſe they make profeſſion of admitting the teſtimony of the Church, as an argument, that can only carry ſome weight with it; but not as a convincing token of truth. So that when they begin to read theſe ſacred books, they ſhould not, in their principles, be penetrated with a firm belief of the divine origin of the Scriptures. They ought to examine, whether the teſtimony given by the Church be undeniably true. In which ſtate, they are not bound to repreſs any repugnance that may ariſe in their minds, to the belief of the reſurrection, of the Trinity, or of other myſteries, the ſublimity of which only affects thoſe, who know the truth of them. The ſame is to be ſaid of ſeveral actions of great men, whoſe praiſes are recorded in theſe books, of ſeveral forms of expreſſion, and of ſome miracles; becauſe Proteſtants cannot, in their principles, diſcover whether this repugnance be the effect of the imbecility of fallen reaſon, or the production of rational diſcuſſion. The ſubmiſſive reſpect of Catholics drives away this ſpirit, which can only be countenanced by thoſe, who are either ignorant, or doubt of the divine authority of the Scrip-

tures. But this is ſufficient to convince reaſonable men, that, if Proteſtants were conſiſtent with their principles, the myſteries of the Holy Scriptures, their miracles, ſtyle, and the effects which they may produce in the mind, would not appear to them in the light of clear marks of its divine origin.

Q. What concluſion do you draw from this?

A. That, though Proteſtants are perpetually extolling the word of God, yet this word of God is not the word of God to them. They have rejected the teſtimony of the Church, from which is derived the ſecurity of this belief. And though they have perſuaded themſelves, that they can repair the ruin of this firm foundation by building upon the characteriſtic marks, which they ſo frequently mention, yet their principles hide the celeſtial brightneſs of theſe marks; or, to ſpeak more properly, they put a blind upon their eyes, which prevents their beholding that heavenly light, which Catholics ſee ſo clearly.

Q. To proceed, tell me next, whether the word of God be clear and perfect in neceſſary matters.

A. It is ſo to Catholics, who read it with that ſpirit of ſubmiſſion, which it commands them to bear to the Holy Ghoſt, who ſpeaks by the mouth of the Church. But this perfection and clearneſs is taken from it by Proteſtants, who ſay, they cannot ſecurely rely on the teſtimony of the Church.

Q. Why do you ſay that the Holy Scripture is clear to thoſe, who are obedient, and obſcure to ſuch, as are diſobedient to the Church?

A. We have only to conſider the perſons, to whom the Holy Scripture was at firſt addreſſed, and the nature of the Holy Scripture itſelf, in order to anſwer this queſtion.

Q. What reflection does the conſideration of thoſe, to whom the Holy Scripture was at firſt addreſſed, furniſh us with?

A. If the different books of the Holy Scripture had

been compoſed for the information of ſuch, as had no certain knowledge of the truths of religion, they ſhould have been rendered clear and perſpicuous to them, who, like the Proteſtants, declare themſelves in the dark concerning theſe truths, before they read them in the Scripture. But if, on the contrary, they were addreſſed to ſuch, as were grounded in the knowledge of the articles of faith, they need only be clear and intelligible to them, who, like Catholics, are inſtructed in theſe articles, before they peruſe theſe ſacred books. Let any one examine the Holy Scripture in this regard, and he will find, that none of theſe books were addreſſed to ſuch as were not previouſly inſtructed. It is moſt evident, as can eaſily be ſhewn, that theſe books were written to ſuch as had ſettled notions of religion. For this reaſon, the meaning of the Holy Scripture is open to Catholics, but ſhut to Proteſtants; becauſe Catholics, in their principles, are in ſimilar diſpoſitions with thoſe, to whom theſe ſacred books were firſt addreſſed, and Proteſtants are not ſo.

Q. What reflection occurs to the mind, when we conſider the Holy Scriptures in the hands of perſons of theſe different diſpoſitions, of Catholics and Proteſtants?

A. That thoſe, who ſubmit to the Church, when they come to ſuch paſſages, as are ſuſceptible of different interpretations, have a light that ſhews the true ſenſe, which thoſe want, who ſay, that all the viſible Church may be deceived in the interpretation of the Holy Scripture, even in thoſe parts which relate to the moſt eſſential articles.

Q. Convince us of this truth by an example.

A. They, for inſtance, who believe the divinity of our Lord, recur to theſe paſſages. *I and the Father are one:* * *there are three that bear teſtimony in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt: and theſe three*

* Jo. x. 30.

are one. * Thoſe who reject this myſtery, apply the following to their cauſe: *The Father is greater than I.* † *I pray that they alſo may be one in us, as thou Father in me and I in thee.* ‡ Theſe different paſſages ſeem to affirm and deny the divinity of our Lord. They muſt undoubtedly be explained by one another, as there is not any contradiction in the Scripture. The point is to know, which are the obſcure paſſages, and which the clear, to ground the explanation upon, and thoſe, who reject the authority of the Church, have no rule, by which to diſtinguiſh them. Indeed we may ſay, that to them all the word of God is obſcure. The Goſpel is hid to them; and thoſe, to whom it is hid, as St. Paul ſays, § are in the way to be loſt. The Catholics, on the contrary, find here a clear light: for having learnt from the Holy Scripture the duty of ſubmiſſion to the Church, they are convinced, that thoſe paſſages, in which the literal ſenſe appears oppoſite to the faith of the Church, are certainly obſcure, and want explanation; and that, on the contrary, thoſe ſentences are clear, which are in harmony with the faith of the Church, and ſhould be employed to open the meaning of the others.

Q. Pleaſe to explain this more at length.

A. I call a ſentence clear, when the letter is in concord with faith, and obſcure, when in oppoſition with it. Hence a knowledge of what faith teaches, is neceſſary to be able to diſtinguiſh the clear from the obſcure. As a Catholic knows, by the teſtimony of the Church, that Jeſus Chriſt is God from all eternity, he knows that the paſſage in which he reads, *I and the Father are one*, is the clear paſſage, becauſe the literal ſenſe is conformable to faith: and that the other, *My Father is greater than I*, is the obſcure, becauſe the letter ſeems to ſet forth ſomething oppoſite to faith. On the other

---

* 1 Jo. v. 7. † Jo. xiv. 28. ‡ Ibid xvii. 20. 21. § 2 Cor. iv. 3.

hand, as a Proteſtant, who by his profeſſion declares his diſbelief of every thing, that he does not find in Scripture, cannot tell, before he looks into it, whether the Meſſiah be God, or only the firſt and moſt excellent of his creatures; ſo neither does he know, whether the literal ſenſe of this ſentence, *I and the Father are one*, be conformable to faith and clear, or whether the literal ſenſe of this other, *My Father is greater than I*, be not more agreeable to faith, and conſequently the clear ſentence, that ſhould throw light on all others, that appertain to this ſubject.

Q. Whither do theſe remarks tend?

A. To evince, that in matters of faith the Holy Scriptures are not clear to Proteſtants. For if this divine word be conſidered according to their principles, it would lead them into endleſs doubts. For which reaſon all thoſe paſſages, in which the Holy Ghoſt informs us how much all doubts in matters of faith are contrary to ſalvation, ought to be looked on as convincing proofs of the illuſion, on which the Proteſtant Religion is founded. *Be no more children toſſed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine:* * *He that wavereth in faith, is like a wave of the ſea, which is driven and toſſed about with the wind. Therefore let not that man think, that he ſhall receive any thing of the Lord.* †

Q. May not Proteſtants ſay, they explain the Scriptures by the Scriptures, as it is related in Eſdras,‡ *that the Levites interpreted the law, and opened the ſenſe of it, explaining it by the Scripture itſelf?*

A. Theſe laſt words, *explaining it by the Scripture itſelf*, are an addition of the Calviniſts. They are neither in the original, nor in the ancient verſions of either Jews or Chriſtians: they were not in the firſt verſions of the Reformers, but were inſerted in the French Calviniſtical tranſlation, in the year 1588. But even if theſe words

---

* Eph. iv. 14. † Jam. i. 6. 7. ‡ Nehem. viii. 8.

were genuine, the cauſe of the reformed Churches would not be promoted. It is admitted that the Holy Scripture is to be explained by the Holy Scripture. Yet the ſame difficulty ſtill remains. For they only, who are joined to the Church by faith, can explain the different parts of the word of God by either texts, as they only, in matters relating to faith, can point out the obſcure paſſages that want unfolding, and which are not to be underſtood in the ſtrict literal ſenſe. They only can direct us to thoſe, that are clear, which are to be taken literally, and are the keys, that unlock the hidden ſecrets of the obſcure paſſages.

Q. Tell me why the Holy Scripture is perfect in regard to thoſe, who ſubmit to the Church, but not ſo to thoſe, who refuſe this ſubmiſſion.

A. The reaſon is, becauſe they who ſubmit to the Church, find this duty of ſubmiſſion clearly expreſſed in it, which, as it compriſes and leads them to the knowledge of all particular points, ſo it entitles them to aſſert that the word of God contains all points neceſſary to ſalvation. Another reaſon is, becauſe there is no article of faith, of which there is not at leaſt ſome ſlight hint or intimation in the ſacred books, which the authority of the Church diſcovers to us, how ſlightly ſoever it may have been propoſed. For which reaſon we find, that in all diſputes relating to faith, both ancient and modern, the Doctors of the Church alledge ſome paſſages of the Holy Scripture in favor of the truth. And this is the only mean by which any one can, conſiſtently with reaſon, hope to diſcover all the truths of faith in the ſacred books. They were written on, and for particular occaſions. Nor does it appear that any individual, nor all the ſacred writers collectively, had any deſign of publiſhing a work, that ſhould contain all the truths of faith, in evident and expreſs terms, excluſive of other light or inſtruction.

Q. What diſadvantage do they lie under in this re-

ſpect, who perſuade themſelves that the whole viſible church may deceive them?

A. They cannot clearly ſee thoſe articles in the ſcriptures, that are only ſlightly touched upon, nor even ſeveral of thoſe, that are more diſtinctly mentioned, ſince even theſe paſſages ſeem to admit different interpretations. Hence thoſe who affirm, that all the viſible church may err, cannot ſay, that all things neceſſary to to ſalvation are clearly and evidently contained in the Holy Scripture.

Q. Are the truths of faith then expreſſed with different degrees of perſpicuity in the Holy Scripture?

A. This difference is obſervable; for the perſpicuity, with which any doctrine is delivered in the Holy Scripture, is proportionable to the number of paſſages, that relate to it, to the greater or leſs conformity of the literal ſenſe of ſuch paſſages to that doctrine, and to the variety and rarity of figurative meanings neceſſary to be given to paſſages, in order to reconcile them with ſuch as ſeem to inculcate an oppoſite doctrine. In proportion to theſe and other marks, a doctrine is taught with more or leſs clearneſs in the Holy Scriptures. Thus, though the eternal Divinity of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt be there clearly pointed out, yet the infallibility of the viſible Church is diſplayed in brighter colours; the ſacraments of penance, of confirmation, of extreme unction are more clearly inculcated than the baptiſm of infants, or the change of the ſabbath, from Saturday to Sunday. The indiſpenſable obligation of never ſeparating from the ancient body of the Church, is revealed, in clearer terms, in the New Teſtament, than the coming of the Meſſiah, in the Old, how incontrovertibly ſoever it be found there. All theſe points of doctrine are grounded on the Holy Scriptures; the firſt are ſeen more diſtinctly, becauſe there are more paſſages relating to them, in which the letter agrees with the doctrine, and fewer, in which the letter has ſome appearance of conveying an oppoſite ſenſe; the latter are not viewed there in ſo

clear a light, either becauſe they are not mentioned ſo frequently, or becauſe they ſeem contrary to a greater number of paſſages, reconcileable only by a figurative interpretation, which is not ſo often uſed in the ſacred books.

Q. What other ſuperiority have Catholics over Proteſtants in this point?

A. In whatſoever degree of evidence, articles of faith are expreſſed in the Holy Scripture, they are always clear to Catholics, who, knowing that the Church cannot deceive them in matters of faith, are aſſured, that in thoſe paſſages in which the letter is moſt conſonant with its doctrine, they muſt ſtop at the obvious meaning of the words, without going into any foreign interpretation. And in regard of paſſages, which the Holy Scripture only touches upon ſlightly, they are not in the dark, but ſee them in as clear a light as they do, who, knowing the thoughts of their friends, eaſily underſtand their ſentiments, from words dropped in converſation, which otherwiſe bear only a ſlender alluſion to them. In ſhort, in thoſe paſſages, where the literal ſenſe ſeems to favor ſome article, which the Church does not approve, or appears contrary to one it propoſes, they ſee clearly that ſuch words are to be taken figuratively, notwithſtanding ſuch a figure may be very unuſual in the Holy Scripture. But as for Proteſtants, who acknowledge no light of faith out of the Holy Scriptures, they cannot make a clear diſcovery in them of moſt articles, without renouncing their principles. They ſtand in the dark, when they come to thoſe paſſages in which the moſt literal ſenſe is contrary to their belief. They ſee nothing of thoſe doctrines, that are only curſorily hinted at in the Holy Scriptures. And even reſpecting thoſe, in which the moſt obvious and literal ſenſe of the words is in agreement with the truth, they have no evidence, not knowing whether thoſe texts may not be of the nature of ſome others, that imply a figurative or metaphorical

meaning, how uncommon ſoever, or even unexemplified, ſuch figure may be in the ſacred writings.

Q. Would not the Holy Scriptures have been ſtill more perfect, if every article neceſſary to ſalvation were there laid down with ſuch a degree of evidence, that by only reading them, all Chriſtians might, with the greateſt facility, have acquired a knowledge of them?

A. It would, on the contrary, have been leſs perfect, becauſe, as it teaches us, the deſign of God was to keep Chriſtians in the humble ſtate of children, and to make them dependent on the authority of the Church, their mother. So that it is a perfection in this holy word, to propoſe ſeveral articles with ſuch an imperfect degree of evidence, that the unſkilled, and even all other Chriſtians, ſhould find themſelves under a neceſſity of recurring in the ſpirit of humility to the Church, to be aſſured of their true meaning.

Q. Ought we to read the word of God?

A. Nothing can be more inſtructive, provided we imitate the example of the eunuch of queen Candace, * and receive with humility the explanation, which God gives by the mouth of the miniſters of his Church. This reading then is moſt uſeful to Catholics, who take up theſe books in the ſpirit of ſubmiſſion to the interpretation of the Church and its paſtors. It can only be hurtful to thoſe, who, deſpiſing the Church, which God commands us to hear, follow only their own private interpretation, and thus wreſt, to their own deſtruction, many paſſages that are hard to be underſtood. † Hence the diſpute between Catholics and Proteſtants is not to know whether, but in what ſpirit, the Holy Scriptures ought to be read. The point is, whether the Catholics or Proteſtants come better diſpoſed to the peruſal of theſe ſacred books.

Q. What do you gather from this?

---

* Act. viii. 31. † 2 Pet. iii. 15. 16.

A. That as the reading of the word of God is very profitable, when undertaken in the diſpoſitions of Catholics; that is, with a mind diſpoſed to ſubmit to the faith of the Church, and is on the contrary very dangerous, when undertaken in the diſpoſitions of Proteſtants, that is, with an independent ſelf-ſufficient ſpirit; ſo there are more juſt reaſons to reproach them than Catholics, with depriving the people of the fruit of theſe holy books.

Q. Draw a general concluſion from all that you have ſaid in this chapter.

A. I conclude, that all thoſe paſſages of the Holy Scripture, which ſhew that it is divinely inſpired, that it is clear, that it is perfect, and that the reading of it is uſeful to the people, are ſo many convincing proofs, that ſtand againſt Proteſtants; becauſe, were we to follow their principles, we ſhould never diſcover in it theſe advantages and perfections. Whence ſo far from oppugning the doctrine of Catholics, as Proteſtants pretend, they are demonſtrations of the truth of their principles, ſince the advantages and fruits, which all Chriſtians ought to ſeek in the Holy Scriptures, can be maintained and preſerved only by adhering to them.

CHAP. XIII.

Of Traditions.

Q. DOES the Church regulate its faith by the word of God only?

A. Yes: But this word of God is contained in the ſacred books which compoſe the Holy Scripture, and in the public Traditions of the Church.

Q. Are theſe public Traditions, by which the Church regulates its faith, approved in the Holy Scripture?

A. This has been already proved in the chapter concerning the infallibility of the Church; for the Traditions, that make up part of our belief, are only articles which were taught by the Apoſtles, and which the Church has tranſmitted from age to age, by the public inſtructions of its miniſters, and by the belief of its children.

Q. Since you mean nothing more by the Traditions which you receive, but public inſtructions relating to faith, which are handed down from age to age, it is unneceſſary to prove there can be no error in them. This is already evinced in all that you have ſaid concerning the privilege granted to the Church, of never falling from the truth. But it may be of ſome uſe to remove the objections, which Proteſtants draw from ſome paſſages of the Holy Scripture. Did then Jeſus Chriſt condemn Traditions, when he ſaid: *Why do you tranſgreſs the commandment of God for your Tradition?**

A. This paſſage only condemns ſome private Traditions. Traditions of this kind are ſometimes good and ſometimes bad. They ſhould be diſcuſſed, and the good only retained. The Traditions of the Phariſees were private Traditions, bad, and oppoſite to the word of God, ſo that we cannot wonder they were cenſured and rejected by Jeſus Chriſt. But the Holy Scripture never condemned any general Traditions of the whole Church, that related to matters of faith. For, as I have juſt ſaid, they are nothing more than the doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt and the Apoſtles, which the Church preſerves with an inviolate fidelity, agreeably to the promiſe made by Jeſus Chriſt, of ſending the ſpirit of truth, to remain with it to the end of the world. †

Q. Have you any thing more to ſay concerning this paſſage, in which our Lord condemns theſe private Traditions of the Phariſees?

---

* Matt. xv. 3. † John xvi. 16. 17.

A. We may obſerve, that the Proteſtant tranſlations preſerved the word *Traditions* in this place, which they induſtriouſly altered in another, where St. Paul recommends Traditions. *Brethren*, ſays he, *hold the Traditions which you have learned, whether by word or by our epiſtle.* * There are, as we are taught by the Holy Spirit, holy Traditions, which we ought to believe, and there are others, which we ought to reject. This is the doctrine of Catholics, and in conformity to it we have retained the word *Traditions*, both in the paſſages, where they are commended, and in that, in which they are condemned. There was not the ſame ſincerity in the Proteſtant tranſlators. For though the ſame Greek word, παραδοσις, be employed in the original, in both the above paſſages, yet they thought proper to give it a different meaning in each of them. In that, which condemns certain Traditions of the Phariſees, they were willing enough to tranſlate it by the word Tradition: *Why do you tranſgreſs the commandment of God by your* TRADITION. † But in that, which recommends Traditions, they were careful to give it a very different ſignification: *Brethren, ſtand faſt, and hold the* ORDINANCES *which you have been taught*, &c. ‡ It was undoubtedly their intention to inſpire their followers with a contempt for Tradition; but ſince they knew this to be a conteſted point, ſincerity ſhould have compelled them to tranſlate the ſame words, in theſe two paſſages, in the ſame manner, and to have owned, that if there be ſome Traditions, which are not to be regarded, as coming from private men, there are others, which muſt be followed, ſince they are derived to us from the Apoſtles. §

---

* 2 Theſ. xi. 14. † Mat. xv 3. ‡ 2 Theſ. xi. 15.

§ This, together with ſome others of the many corruptions, which had been introduced into the firſt Engliſh Proteſtant verſions, was corrected afterwards by the tranſlators employed by James the 1ſt. But it was then too late: they had been adopted in order to withdraw the people from the faith of their forefathers, and were not changed, till long after they had had that effect.

Q. God ſays in the Old Teſtament, *You ſhall not add to the word that I ſpeak to you, neither ſhall you take away from it:** and in the New, *I teſtify to every one, that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book: if any man ſhall add to theſe things, God ſhall add unto him the plagues written in this book. And if any man ſhall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God ſhall take away his part out of the book of life*;† can theſe paſſages be reconciled with the Catholic doctrine of tradition?

A. The firſt of theſe quotations, which is from the writings of Moſes, neither can be contrary to divine traditions, which were neceſſary to determine the meaning of paſſages relating to eſſential articles, that were ſuſceptible of different interpretations, nor to eccleſiaſtical traditions, which deliver down from age to age particular precepts of the Church, for the edification of the people. For without the firſt, which are the divine traditions that relate to faith, it would have been difficult to have acquired, from the books of Moſes, a clear, diſtinct, and evident knowledge of ſeveral eſſential articles, as of the immortality of the ſoul, of the reſurrection of the body, of heaven, of hell, and even of the divine origin of the books themſelves. Without divine traditions, the clear and determinate meaning of ſeveral precepts, liable to different interpretations, and neceſſary to be practiſed, could not even have been underſtood. And without the ſecond kind, namely, Eccleſiaſtical traditions, the memory of the ſolemnities eſtabliſhed by the Church of Iſrael, could not have been invariably preſerved; ſuch as the feſtival of the deliverance effected by Eſther;‡ that of the dedication of the Temple;§ and the faſts of the fourth, fifth, ſeventh, and tenth months.¶

---

* Deut. iv. 2. † Apoc. xxii. 18. ‡ Eſth. ix. 17.
§ Jo. 10. 22. ¶ Zach. vii. 5. viii. 19.

Q. How then is this paſſage to be explained, *you ſhall not add to the word, that I ſpeak to you, neither ſhall you take away from it?*

A. An exact compliance with the law of Moſes is here enjoined: ſo that it rather tends to eſtabliſh, than take away, tradition, which was frequently neceſſary to clear up the true meaning of the Moſaic precepts. Hence *to take away from the law*, means to omit the obſervance of it, and to *add to it*, means to obſerve it, but not in the manner preſcribed. If this paſſage were to be taken in a more literal ſignification, the Church of the old law ſhould have been oppoſed, when it decreed that the feaſt of the dedication of the altar ſhould be yearly obſerved, which our Lord and his Apoſtles went to ſolemnize at Jeruſalem; * even the ſacred books, that were written after the death of Moſes, ſhould be proſcribed.

Q. Pleaſe to expound the text from the Apocalypſe, *If any man ſhall add to theſe things, God ſhall add to him, &c.*

A. This does not prohibit Traditions, for they are not additions to the word of God, ſince they help us to underſtand the true meaning of it. They are even commended in the Holy Scriptures, ſo that to reject them, is to take away ſomething from the word of God, and of courſe to bring ourſelves under the condemnation pronounced in this ſentence. Beſides theſe words relate only to the Apocalypſe: *I teſtify to every one, that heareth the words of the prophecy of* THIS *book. If any man ſhall take away from the words of the book of* THIS *prophecy.* So that, if we were to explain this paſſage as Proteſtants do, we ſhould find there a prohibition of receiving any articles, that are not clearly con-

* Mach. iv. 59. Jo. x. 22.

tained in the Apocalypſe, or even of admitting, that any of the other books of the Holy Scripture, are of divine inſpiration.

Q. What then is the import of this verſe?

A. The intent of the Holy Spirit was to deter all, who ſhould read the book of the Apocalypſe, from altering the words of it, or perhaps from corrupting the meaning by forced explanations. This prohibition was very neceſſary, as Heretics, by doing theſe things, have frequently miſapplied the Holy Scriptures to bad purpoſes. They change the words, or if they ſpare the text, they diſtort it from its true meaning. It was then very expedient to inſert this prohibition in the New Teſtament, and particularly to place it in the Apocalypſe, which of all others has been the moſt falſely interpreted by innovators. This is the reaſon, why the command of the Holy Ghoſt is ſo expreſs againſt either taking away, or adding to that book.

Q. Are traditions overthrown by thoſe paſſages, in which the Holy Spirit points out the utility of the Holy Scriptures, as that for example, of St. Paul to Timothy: *the Holy Scriptures, which thou haſt known from thy youth, which can inſtruct thee to ſalvation, through the faith which is in Chriſt Jeſus. All Scripture, inſpired of God, is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to inſtruct in juſtice, that the man of God may be perfect?* *

A. The miſapplication of this paſſage, by Proteſtants, is manifeſt; for St. Paul there ſpeaks only of the books of the Old Teſtament, which are the *Holy Scriptures*, that St. Timothy had known from his youth. Whence, if the meaning of that paſſage be, that nothing is to be received, except the Holy Scriptures, which are there mentioned; it will follow, that not only Traditions, but all the books of the New Teſtament, are unprofitable.

* 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16, 17.

Beſides, the text does not affirm, that *all Scripture*, &c. is ſufficient, but only *that it is profitable*, &c. But to what end is it profitable? To conduct men to Jeſus Chriſt, *through faith which is in Jeſus Chriſt*, ſays St. Paul, not to teach them all the articles and particular precepts of Chriſtianity. But even though this laſt were the true meaning of it, Traditions muſt be included, ſince the ſame ſcripture recommends them in ſeveral places, and particularly in thoſe paſſages, which affirm, that the Holy Spirit will remain in the heart of the church, and that his word of truth will never depart out of its mouth. For divine Traditions are only the public teſtimonies of the Church concerning the faith, which the Apoſtles preached.

Q. Explain likewiſe that part of the Epiſtle to the Galatians, which Proteſtants commonly recur to on this ſubject. *Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a goſpel to you beyond that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema.** Does this paſſage ſhew, that anathema ſhould be pronounced againſt thoſe, who attempt to join Traditions to the Holy Scriptures?

A. It is difficult to conceive how Proteſtants can produce this text, as an argument for adhering excluſively to the Holy Scriptures, which are not even mentioned in it. The faithful are there exhorted to be religiouſly attached, not to what was written, but to what was preached. So that we may even ſay, that this paſſage is favorable to the Traditions of the Church, ſince the doctrine, which the Apoſtles preached, is conveyed to us, not only by the Holy Scriptures, but likewiſe by Tradition; and it is the more favorable, ſince the Holy Spirit hath there given us a rule of direction in regard to faith, which was to be obſerved, not only in the Apoſtolic times, but likewiſe in all ages of the Church. At whatever time any

* Gal. i. 8. This is the ſenſe of the French Calviniſtical Verſion.

man riſes to preach to Chriſtians any doctrine, that differs from that which has been preached and tranſmitted through all ages to their times, he falls under this anathema. Theſe public inſtructions, which the Holy Spirit commands us to hear and not to deſpiſe, are what we call the Tradition of the Church.

Q. Have you any thing more to add on this paſſage?

A. I remark, that though St. Paul had not ſaid *that which we have preached to you*, but *that which was written*, yet this verſe could not have furniſhed an argument againſt Traditions. For St. Paul could not mean to condemn whatever might be written afterwards, ſince in that caſe, he would condemn all the books of the New Teſtament, which were written after the epiſtle to the Galatians. He only condemned whatever might be contrary to that, which he had preached to them. For St. Paul there reprehends the Galatians, for permitting themſelves to be troubled by ſeducers, whoſe aim was to pervert the goſpel of Jeſus Chriſt. His anathema, therefore, is pointed at articles, that are ſubverſive of the goſpel, and conſequently oppoſite to that, which he had preached to the Galatians. Now Traditions confirm the belief of the goſpel, and put it paſt all doubt. They are conſonant to that doctrine which the Apoſtles preached. They are the very ſame inſtructions, which the Apoſtles gave, and which the Church preſents to us as ſhe received them. The goſpel authorizes them in ſeveral places, as I have obſerved. Thus we may ſay, that even in this ſenſe, the paſſage is diametrically oppoſite to Proteſtants on this ſubject. In condemning the Traditions of the Church, they preach againſt that, which the Apoſtles preached and wrote, and thus incur the anathema, which they endeavour to fix upon Catholics.

CHAP. XIV.

Of Councils.

Q. IF any differences of conſiderable importance ariſe in the Church, how does the Holy Scripture teach us to terminate them?

A. By Councils. In them God hath eſtabliſhed the principal authority of the Church, to make any alterations in regard to diſcipline, which the circumſtances of times may render neceſſary, and in regard of faith to point out what are the true articles, which it teaches.

Q. Is the Church authorized, on particular occaſions, to make changes in regard of diſcipline, even in things, that appear to be regulated by the word of God?

A. It is: for God hath not eſtabliſhed them ſo, that no alteration can ever take place. We ſee, for example, that although the Apoſtles gave a command of refraining from blood and things ſtrangled, yet the Church afterwards did not judge, that this command was always to continue in force.

Q. Shew, from the word of God, that ſubmiſſion is due to the authority of general Councils.

A. All thoſe paſſages, that repreſent to us the wiſdom of God, and his love for the Church, ſhould convince us of this. As that legiſlator would give us no great idea of his prudence, who, in drawing up laws for the government of a Society, ſhould neglect to appoint judges to explain and determine the meaning of the laws, when called in queſtion or oppoſed; ſo it would be highly unbecoming the wiſdom of God, to have given laws to his Church in the Holy Scripture, and yet have neglected to appoint a tribunal, which might lay open and decide the meaning of them, when diſputes ſhould make it neceſſary. He would have formed a ſociety of diſ-

order and confuſion. But *God*, as St. Paul ſays, *is not the God of diſſention, but of peace.** Hence it cannot be doubted, but that God hath fixed a tribunal to ſettle men in peace, and to decide all controverſies among Chriſtians about the meaning of the word of God.

Q. Do we find any paſſages in the Holy Scriptures, that more peculiarly relate to this duty of ſubmiſſion to Councils?

A. There are ſome both in the Old and New Teſtament.

Q. What is there in the Old Teſtament concerning this ſubject?

A. Moſes, by an expreſs order, commands every one to acquieſce in the determination of the great Council of the Jews, which was a kind of perpetual Council. He orders an exemplary puniſhment to be inflicted on all, who ſhould preſume to oppoſe the judgment of this Council, concerning the meaning of the law, when it had been declared by the mouth of the Pontiff. *Thou ſhalt come*, ſays he, *to the prieſts of the Levitical race, and to the judge that ſhall be at that time, and thou ſhalt aſk of them, and they ſhall ſhew thee the truth of the judgment. And thou ſhalt do whatſoever they ſhall ſay, that preſide in the place which the Lord ſhall chooſe, and what they ſhall teach thee, according to his law; and thou ſhalt follow their ſentence, neither ſhalt thou decline to the right hand nor to the left hand. But he that will be proud, and refuſe to obey the commandment of the prieſt who miniſtereth at that time to the Lord thy God, and the decree of the judge, that man ſhall die, and thou ſhalt take away the evil from Iſrael.*† Certainly God would have ſhewn leſs love for the Chriſtian Church than for that of the Jews, had he not fixed a centre of union, by forbidding any to reject the deci-

---

* 1 Cor. xiv. 33. † Deut. xvii. 9.

ſions of the Biſhops aſſembled in Council, concerning the interpretation of his holy word.

Q. On what part of the New Teſtament do you ground your ſubmiſſion to Councils, when they decide differences in matters of faith, and draw the line of diſtinction between truth and error?

A. On the promiſes, which God made to his Church; on thoſe in particular given to paſtors, when aſſembled in Council; and on the firſt accompliſhment of theſe promiſes in the Council of Jeruſalem.

Q. What promiſes did God make to the Church, that can give us ſecurity of his preſiding over the deciſions of Councils?

A. There are of two kinds. The promiſes which inſure its infallibility, and thoſe which relate to its extent.

Q. It is evident, that the promiſes of infallibility made to the Church, include the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt in Councils lawfully aſſembled; but in what manner is this truth proved from the promiſes, that relate to its extent?

A. As general Councils are compoſed of a great multitude of biſhops, ſeparated from each other by diſtance of habitation, by oppoſite intereſts, by diſſimilar ideas and ſentiments, it is impoſſible that they ſhould conſpire together, to give falſe teſtimony concerning a fact ſo public, as the belief of their reſpective Churches on the queſtion then controverted. If they ſhould all conſpire in this manner, by affirming that they held opinions, which they never did, ſo manifeſt and public an impoſition muſt be the effect of ſome extraordinary violence and conſtraint, which would be known to all the world, and againſt which the biſhops would exclaim, as ſoon as they were at liberty. The calm aſſent of a general Council to an article of faith is then an evident proof of the faith of the particular Churches, from which the Biſhops are aſſembled, who compoſe the Council, and of courſe is the voice and approbation of the univerſal Church, which,

according to the promiſes recorded in the Holy Scriptures, always teaches the truth.

Q. How is the aſſurance of the aſſiſtance of the Holy Spirit, in lawful Councils, founded on the promiſes made by our Lord, in the Holy Scriptures, to paſtors aſſembled together?

A. Jeſus Chriſt ſaid to his Apoſtles: *where there are two or three gathered together in my name, there am I in the midſt of them.* * A general principle, relating to the promiſes and laws given to the Apoſtles is, that ſuch as are equally neceſſary for the Church in after ages, as they were for the Church in their times, muſt be underſtood to extend to the Church of all ages. The aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt is not leſs neceſſary for the Church, in its lawful Councils, than it was at the beginning, in the time of the Apoſtles. This promiſe, then, muſt relate to the paſtors aſſembled in every age of the Church. It is not meant of provincial or national Councils, becauſe, as the Church can have recourſe to a higher authority, the preſence of Jeſus Chriſt is not eſſentially neceſſary in theſe. But, as among all human means, it hath nothing higher than an univerſal Council, ſo it is indiſpenſably neceſſary for the termination of the moſt important matters, to be aſſured of the preſence of Jeſus Chriſt in theſe univerſal Councils. There can be no doubt, then, but theſe Councils have a right to lay claim to the promiſe, made by Jeſus Chriſt, to the paſtors of the Church aſſembled together, *When there are two or three gathered together in my name, there am I in the midſt of them.*

Q. How does the example of the firſt Council of Jeruſalem ſhew, that ſubmiſſion is due to lawful Councils? †

A. A difference having ariſen among the firſt Chriſtians, a Council was aſſembled at Jeruſalem, the deciſions of which were received as oracles delivered by the Holy

* Matt. xviii. 20. † Acts xv.

Ghoſt. Here is an example for all ages of the Church. Each individual Apoſtle was poſſeſſed of a right to command obedience, from the firſt Chriſtians, to his deciſion reſpecting the diſputes of thoſe times. But they reſolved to aſſemble a Council, that they might leave an example to following ages, of the means they ought to recur to, in compoſing differences, that might divide the ſentiments of Chriſtians.

Q. What anſwer ſhould be given to Proteſtants, when, to apologize for their oppoſition to Councils, they alledge the example of the Apoſtles and other faithful, who diſſented from the great Council of the Jews, that condemned our Saviour? This, ſay they, is an argument of the obligation, that Chriſtians are under, of examining the decrees of Councils, and of refuſing ſubmiſſion, till they ſee, that their deciſions agree with the Holy Scripture.

A. Three things point out a great difference, between this aſſembly of the Jews, and thoſe Councils of the Church, which are rejected by Proteſtants, and convince us of the weakneſs of the argument, which they draw from the condemnation pronounced by the ſynagogue againſt our Lord, in juſtification of their diſobedience to the Councils of the Catholic Church, by which they have been condemned.

Q. What is the firſt?

A. God's promiſe of protection to the Jewiſh Church was limited. He foretold the eſtabliſhment of a new covenant, and the choice he would make of a new people. *Behold, the days ſhall come, ſaith the Lord,* by the prophet Jeremy, *and I will make a new covenant with the houſe of Iſrael, and with the houſe of Juda: not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt.** *I have ſpread forth my hands all the*

* Jerem. xxxi. 31. Heb. viii. 8.

day, ſaith God in other places, *to an unbelieving people.* * *I will provoke you to jealouſy by that which is not a nation; by a fooliſh nation I will anger you.* † It is moreover certain, that both the Holy Scripture and the Tradition of the Jewiſh Church diſtinguiſhed, and pointed out that time for the coming of our Lord, the Ambaſſador of the new alliance. No one then could reaſonably perſuade himſelf, that God would continue to inſpire the aſſemblies of the Jewiſh Church, after the coming of the Meſſiah. But when the Proteſtants engaged in the Reformation, they had no aſſurance, that God would at that time withdraw his protection from the aſſemblies of the Chriſtian Church, nor that this would ever be the caſe. On the contrary, the expreſs promiſe of Jeſus Chriſt is clear, by which he has inſured to it the preſence of his grace to the end of the world.

Q. Have you any thing more to add to this anſwer?

A. I add, that a review of the hiſtory of the aſſemblies of the Jewiſh Church ſhould even lead us to a concluſion directly oppoſite. We find, that God always watched over and directed the deciſions of the Jewiſh Church, relating to faith, during the time fixed for the continuation of its authority, ſo that nothing erroneous can be diſcovered in them during that time; neither was the divine aſſiſtance withheld from it, till the time, in which it was expreſsly foretold by the Holy Ghoſt, that this authority ſhould ceaſe. Hence it follows, that God moſt aſſuredly preſides over the determinations of the lawful aſſemblies of the Chriſtian Church, in matters of faith, during the time of the promiſed aſſiſtance of the Holy Spirit, that is, to the end of the world. Otherwiſe the faith of Chriſtians would be leſs ſecure, than that of the Jews had been, and the promiſes, which God made to the Church of Jeſus Chriſt, would be in-

---

* Iſai. lxv. 2. † Rom. x. 19, 21, and Deut. xxxii. 21.

fringed, whilſt thoſe made to the ſynagogue have been faithfully obſerved.

Q. Which is the ſecond thing, that ſhews a difference between the deciſions of the Church oppoſed by Proteſtants, and that of the Synagogue rejected by the Apoſtles?

A. This deciſion of the Synagogue was not founded on that, which of all external things is the principal, on which the deciſions of Councils are grounded, I mean the unanimous teſtimony, that the Church gives, concerning any particular article, by propoſing it as a public fact, received at the beginning, before numberleſs witneſſes, and atteſted by them through all ages. The enquiry of the Synagogue was not of this nature, but whether this individual man, called Jeſus of Nazareth, was the true Meſſiah. The body of the Jewiſh Church did not contend, at that time, that Moſes had told all the Iſraelites, whom he inſtructed in the deſert, that this Jeſus was not the Meſſiah, and that this fact had been handed down from all preceding generations to them. The Synagogue, therefore, in this point, wanted the principal foundation, on which Councils build their deciſions. Hence Proteſtants cannot be ſaid to reaſon with preciſion, when from this falſe decree of the Synagogue they conclude, that it is lawful to doubt of, examine, and reject the deciſions of the Catholic Church in articles of faith; for theſe deciſions, on the contrary, are grounded on that, which is the principal foundation of the deciſions of Councils. The Councils, which condemned the Proteſtants, had drawn their decrees concerning matters of faith from the Tradition of the Church of their times. For the whole Church of thoſe times propoſed the articles, which were confirmed by theſe decrees, as articles, that were grounded on the teſtimony of the univerſal Church, from its firſt eſtabliſhment through all ſubſequent generations without any interruption; that is to ſay, the language of the Church concerning them was this: *The Apoſtles taught the whole*

Church theſe articles, and they have always been publicly taught by the Church in all generations to the preſent time.

Q. Do you ſubjoin any thing to this ſecond anſwer?

A. I obſerve, as I have done concerning the preceding anſwer, that the example of the Jewiſh Church points out an inference contrary to that, which is drawn from it by Proteſtants. If we ſee, that the Synagogue erred in a point, in which it was not ſupported by the teſtimony of all the Church of its time, we have no example of ſuch error, in any article relating to faith, in which it had this teſtimony on its ſide. The Jewiſh Church affirmed at that time, that the books of the Old Teſtament were divinely inſpired; that a Meſſiah would come; that there was a future life; that the dead would ariſe, &c. It ſaid, theſe articles were received by the whole Church of Iſrael, together with the firſt truths, that God had revealed to it, and that it had confirmed them in every ſucceeding generation. In all theſe things it adhered to truth, nor is any error diſcoverable in any of its articles of faith, concerning which it aſſerted that the public Tradition of all ages, from the firſt revelation, was conſonant with its teſtimony. We muſt then infer from this example of the Church of Iſrael, that the Chriſtian Church cannot ſtray from faith, when its deciſions coincide with a teſtimony of this kind; that is, of the general body, when the voice of the Church is, that the article decided by the Council was firſt delivered by the Apoſtles to the Church, and taught by it through every generation. If the Chriſtian Church could err in articles of faith, that are ſupported by a teſtimony of this kind, its ſtate of ſecurity would not be ſo firmly eſtabliſhed as that of the Jewiſh Church; ſince that never deviated from the truth in articles of faith, that reſted on ſuch a teſtimony. And this, as I have already obſerved, is not only contrary to God's love and promiſes made to the Church of Jeſus Chriſt, but likewiſe to ſound reaſon, which convinces us, that the teſtimony of the Chriſtian Church, on account of

its extent, muſt be of greater weight than that of the Jewiſh Church. Now the deciſions of Councils, which the reformers oppoſed, were concerning articles of faith, that had ſuch teſtimonies on their ſide.

Q. What other difference is there between the aſſembly of the Jewiſh Church, that condemned Jeſus Chriſt, and thoſe Councils of the Church, which Proteſtants refuſe to hear?

A. There was on earth, at that time, a divine authority, highly raiſed above that of the Synagogue, which was only a figure, that was to paſs away on the appearance of the reality. I ſpeak of the authority of Jeſus Chriſt, who proved his divine miſſion by innumerable miracles. In fact, a deciſion concerning faith, that is made by an authority of divine eſtabliſhment, ſhould not be looked on as determinative, when, in oppoſition to a deciſion of a ſuperior authority, that ſubſiſts at the ſame time. The authority of our Lord, confirmed by numberleſs miracles, was manifeſtly higher, than the authority of the Synagogue, which had no claim to any power but as it related to Jeſus Chriſt, to whom it referred all, as to the end of the law. It was the dawn of the day, which ended at the ſunriſe. So that all the deciſions of the Synagogue, which contradicted the doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt, were evidently null. Proteſtants cannot pretend to ſay, that there was any authority on earth ſuperior to that of thoſe Councils, which they have deſpiſed; for it is inconteſtibly certain, that, at the time of the Reformation, there was not any authority more eminent than that of thoſe Councils, which repreſented the univerſal Church; Councils which, on this account, were received by the whole Church, as well as by every particular Church, of which the whole is compoſed. The Church, in a diſperſed ſtate, cannot differ from itſelf when aſſembled together. For which reaſon, general Councils, lawfully convened and holden, were always received by all generations of the Church. Proteſtants then cannot in any wiſe apologize for their want of ſub-

miſſion to theſe Councils, by pleading the oppoſition of the Apoſtles, and the reſt of the faithful, to the decrees of the agogue againſt Jeſus Chriſt.

Q. Will you likewiſe add any thing to this third anſwer?

A. I add the ſame as to the two foregoing. The example of the Jewiſh Church directs us to conclude differently from Proteſtants. The faithful among the Iſraelites never pretended, by reaſoning and ſpeculating on the Scripture, to diſcover a right of oppoſing the deciſions of the Jewiſh Church. This right only belonged to an authority of a much higher kind, and of which it was but the ſhadow; and it was this authority that compelled the Apoſtles to refuſe ſubmiſſion to its decrees. Chriſtians then are likewiſe bound to acquieſce in the authority of the Councils of the Chriſtian Church, till they ſee on earth ſome more eminent authority, which never will happen, till Jeſus Chriſt comes again to judge the living and the dead. For which reaſon, the example of the Jewiſh Church is remarkable on this ſubject, and ſhews us, that Chriſtians are under an indiſpenſable obligation of ſubmitting, till the end of time, to the deciſions of general Councils concerning articles of faith, ſince they repreſent the Church, and, on that account, have always been received by the body of the Church in every ſucceeding generation.

Q. Is this all you intend to ſay on this ſubject?

A. This laſt conſideration may make a deep impreſſion on the minds of the unlearned, who compoſe the main body of the Church. At that period of time, when Jeſus Chriſt was on earth, they beheld an authority ſuperior to that of the Synagogue. The multitude of his miracles, which they were witneſſes to, aſcertained this truth. They could then ſee, without help, that the judgment of the Synagogue was erroneous. But it is moſt manifeſt, that the unlearned are not poſſeſſed of any means, that can enable them to form a ſolid judgment, that the Church errs in its explanations of the

Holy Scripture: a clear proof, that it never was the deſign of God to take them from under its authority on any occaſion, and that they ought to hearken to the deciſions of Councils with great ſubmiſſion.

Q. Proteſtants object here, that, according to the doctrine of Catholics, the deciſion of the Synagogue ſhould have prevented their diſcovering, that the authority of Jeſus Chriſt was from heaven, becauſe his miracles, which are the means beſt proportioned to the capacities of the unlearned for diſcerning this truth, might have been true or falſe miracles. And as, according to Catholics, it belongs to the Church to diſtinguiſh true miracles from falſe, ſo in like manner, in the principles laid down by Catholics, when the Synagogue looked on the miracles of Jeſus Chriſt as falſe, this was a ſufficient reaſon for the faithful of that time to reject the miracles of Jeſus Chriſt.

A. This diſtinction of true and falſe miracles is only admiſſible in regard of ſuch, as are inconſiderable in their kind, number, and other circumſtances, that accompany them. When they are of this nature, they may be true or falſe, and then it is commendable to wait for the deciſion of the Church, as there are grounds on which a doubt may be well founded. But there is no room for ſuch a diſtinction in regard of miracles, that are manifeſtly true, and ſhew themſelves by their nature, their number, and other concomitant circumſtances, as were the miracles of Moſes, and of Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles. The finger of God is viſible in them; and the moſt ignorant may, without conſulting the Church, perceive a divine authority, that ſhines before their eyes, and have reaſon to cry out with a firm faith: *No man can do theſe miracles, unleſs God be with him. When the Chriſt cometh, ſhall he do more miracles than theſe which this man doth.* * Theſe were the words of thoſe Jews,

* John vii. 31. and iii. 2.

who ſincerely ſought their ſalvation, and theſe miracles enforced a belief in Jeſus Chriſt. On the ſame account our Lord ſaid to all the Jews, that *they were inexcuſable, becauſe he had done among them works, that no other man had done.* *

Q. What concluſion do you draw from this?

A. It manifeſtly appears to be the will of God to govern mankind by ſome authority, as he knows how incapable the generality are of examining and diſcuſſing points of faith. And as he has depoſited his truths in the Church, certainly the faithful ought to ſubmit to the authority of its teſtimony. If conteſtations ariſe about this teſtimony, the authority of an aſſembly of the leaders of the Church ſhould terminate them. Whenever it was the will of God, that mankind ſhould be no longer governed by the authority of theſe leaders, he has always pointed out ſome other authority of a much higher order. Such, in compariſon of the authority of the Synagogue, was that of our Lord and his Apoſtles, whoſe divine miſſion was confirmed by a multitude of aſtoniſhing miracles, which being always on the ſide of truth, muſt be in oppoſition to error.

Q. If we ought always to acquieſce in the doctrine of the Church, when its peace is undiſturbed, and the deciſions of Councils ſhould always be received, when any diſputes endanger a diviſion, there cannot be any difficulty in finding the truths of faith, and it would not be neceſſary to meditate continually on the Holy Scriptures, as the Holy Ghoſt ordains.

A. It is true that, in the principles of Catholics, there is no difficulty in finding the articles, that faith teaches, and this is one ſtrong proof of the ſolid foundation of their principles. For as Chriſtianity was deſigned to be the means of the ſalvation of an innumerable multitude of the unlearned, it ſhould be eaſy to attain to the know-

* John xv. 24.

ledge of it. But it would not be eaſy to diſcover the truths of faith, in the principles of Proteſtants, who maintain that the viſible Church may give explanations of the Holy Scripture, that are incompatible with ſalvation, and that every one is bound, in regard to all eſſential points, to examine the orthodoxy of its interpretations. This principle leads them to continual diſputes, far above the reach of the greateſt part of Chriſtians; diſputes, in which God has even commanded them not to engage, nor concern themſelves. *If any man*, ſays St. Paul, *ſeem to be contentious, we have no ſuch cuſtom, nor the Church of God. Avoid contentions and ſtrivings about the law: for they are unprofitable and vain.* * This characteriſtic of Chriſtianity, viz. an averſion from contention, is peculiar to the Catholic Religion. But it ordains at the ſame time, according to the direction of the Holy Ghoſt, that we ſhould learn in the ſpirit of ſubmiſſion, and for this end, that we ought to meditate day and night on the law of God. †

CHAP. XV.

Of the Pope.

Q. DOES the word of God teach us, that there ought to be a primacy among the Paſtors of the Church, that this primacy is of divine right, and that it implies, not only a precedence of honor and dignity, but likewiſe a pre-eminence of authority and juriſdiction?

A. It does. God in the Old Teſtament appointed a High Prieſt, of whom he ſaid, by the mouth of Moſes:

* 1 Cor. xi. 16. 1 Tim. vi. 4. 5. and 20. 2 Tim. ii. 16. 23. 24. Tit. iii. 9. † Ps. i. 2.

He that will be proud and refuſe to obey the commandment of the Prieſt, that man ſhall die, and all the people hearing it ſhall fear, that no one afterwards ſwell with pride. *

Q. Does the Goſpel point out any primacy and ſupreme authority in the Chriſtian Church?

A. Jeſus Chriſt ſpeaks of one, who was to be the greateſt, and was to govern others. He directs him to be moſt humble, and ſets before him his own example, who being maſter, choſe rather to ſerve his creatures than to be ſerved by them. *He that is greater among you, let him be as the younger: and he that is the leader, as he that ſerveth,* † *as the ſon of man came not to be miniſtered unto, but to miniſter, and to give his life a redemption for many.* ‡ There was then to be one in the Church, who ſhould be greater than others, and ſhould govern them, who in the exerciſe of his power, ought to follow the example of humility, left by our Lord, and is to ſhew himſelf a pattern to the reſt of mankind.

Q. On whom did Jeſus Chriſt confer this dignity?

A. On St. Peter, as we learn from the ſame paſſage. For after our Lord had declared, that there ſhould be a chief, a leader in his Church, who ſhould be as it were his ſubſtitute, ſhould repreſent him, and ſhould receive from him a power of ſuperiority in his ſtead, he immediately addreſſed himſelf to St. Peter in theſe words: *Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath deſired to have you, that he may ſift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not: and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren.* §

Q. Are there any marks of St. Peter's ſuperiority in the New Teſtament?

A. There are ſeveral. For example, St. Peter is commonly mentioned before the other Apoſtles, even before St. Andrew his brother, though he was younger,

---

* Deut. xvii. 12. 13.
† Luke xxii. 26.
‡ Mat. xx. 28.
§ Luke xxii. 31.

and called after him to the Apoſtleſhip. When the Evangeliſts give the names of all the Apoſtles, they mention, the others promiſcuouſly. By St. Matthew St. Andrew, and by St. Mark St. James is named before the other ten: by St. Luke, ſometimes St. Andrew, and ſometimes St. John. * But they all agree in naming St. Peter firſt, when they give a catalogue of the Apoſtles.

Q. What other marks of St. Peter's ſuperiority have you obſerved in the Evangeliſts?

A. When they mention St. Andrew, they commonly add this obſervation, that he was the *brother of Simon Peter.* † But they never have ſtyled St. Peter the brother of St. Andrew. Which ſhews they knew there was a dignity in St. Peter, that made it honorable for St. Andrew to be related to him. When St. Matthew delivers the names of the twelve Apoſtles, he does not only mention St. Peter before the others, but expreſsly gives him the name of the firſt. *The firſt*, ſays he, *Simon who is called Peter.* ‡ Our Lord does not only change his name, but likewiſe gives him that of Cephas, which, according to the explanation of Jeſus Chriſt, ſignifies that he was the rock, on which he would build his Church. §

Q. Continue to point out the marks of St. Peter's ſuperiority, that are found in the Goſpel.

A. Our Lord diſtinguiſhes him in particular with ſome prerogatives, which he only gives to the other Apoſtles in a body. For example, the twelve Apoſtles are repreſented as the twelve foundations of the City of God; ‖ but he ſaid only to St. Peter in particular: *On thee I will build my Church.* Our Lord ſaid to the Apoſtles in general; *whatever you ſhall bind upon earth,*

---

* Mat. x. 2. Marc. iii. 17. Luke vi. 14. Act. i. 13.
† Mat. iv. 18. and x. 2. Marc. i. 16. Jo. i. 40 and vi. 8.
‡ Mat. x. 2. § Mat. xvi. 18. ‖ Apoc. xxi. 14.

ſhall be bound alſo in heaven: And whatever you ſhall looſe upon earth ſhall be looſed alſo in heaven. * But St. Peter is the only one, to whom our Lord ſaid in particular: *I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatſoever thou ſhalt bind upon earth, it ſhall be bound alſo in heaven: And whatſoever thou ſhalt looſe upon earth, it ſhall be looſed alſo in heaven.* † In like manner Jeſus Chriſt ſaid only to St. Peter in particular; *feed my ſheep,* ‡ which he repeated ſeveral times, to make the commiſſion more ſolemn, and to fix the attention of the Church on this mark of diſtinction, with which he privileged this Apoſtle.

Q. Does this difference, made by our Lord, prove any ſuperiority in St. Peter?

A. Certainly: For if a king ſhould ſay to any one, that he created him General of his army, we ſhould eaſily underſtand his command to be higher than theirs, to whom the King ſhould ſay in terms applicable to all, that he appointed them Generals of his army.

Q. Does the New Teſtament ſupply any other marks of the primacy of St. Peter?

A. He was the perſon, who opened the gates of the Church to the Jews and Gentiles; to the Jews by his preaching on the day of Pentecoſt, § and to the Gentiles by his diſcourſe with Cornelius. ‖ He preſided in the aſſembly, in which St. Mathias was choſen to take the place of Judas, ¶ and in the council of Jeruſalem, in which he propounded the ſubject of debate. ** St. Paul went to viſit him before all the other Apoſtles. *After three years, I went,* ſays he, *to Jeruſalem to ſee Peter, and I tarried with him fifteen days: But other of the Apoſtles I ſaw none; ſaving James, the brother of the Lord.* ††

---

* Mat. xviii. 18. † Mat. xvi. 19. ‡ John xxi. 15. 16.
§ Act. ii. 14. ‖ Act. x. 34. ¶ Act. i. 15.
** Act. xv. 7. †† Gal. i. 18.

Q. Is there any other proof of St. Peter's primacy in the Goſpel?

A. There is a very ſtriking one; I mean that St. Peter is frequently mentioned by name in the ſame verſe, in which the other Apoſtles are only ſpoken of in general terms. For example, St. Mark ſays: *Simon and they, that were with him, followed after the Lord.* The ſame Evangeliſt relates that the Angels ſaid to the women: *Go tell his diſciples and Peter, that he goeth before you into Galilee.* * St. Luke ſpeaks in the ſame manner. *Peter*, ſays he in his Goſpel, *and they that were with him, were heavy with ſleep,* † and in the Acts: *But Peter and the Apoſtles anſwering, ſaid: We ought to obey God rather than men.* ‡ St. Peter would not be diſtinguiſhed in this manner from the others, unleſs on account of ſome ſuperiority.

Q. Was not this primacy in the Church to end at the death of the Apoſtles?

A. We know, that an eſtabliſhment made by Jeſus Chriſt, is always to remain, when it is as neceſſary for future ages, as it was for the beginning of Chriſtianity. For which reaſon the adminiſtration of the Sacraments is continued, though the words of Jeſus Chriſt were addreſſed to the Apoſtles, when he ordained them. The primacy is not leſs neceſſary for the Church in its ſucceeding generations, than at its firſt origin. It is even more neceſſary, on account of the greater number, and leſs ſanctity of its miniſters.

Q. Is it not probable, that if there had been a primacy among the diſciples of our Lord, he would not have taken occaſion, from the diſpute concerning ſuperiority among them, to ſay: *the kings of the Gentiles lord it over them: but you not ſo?* §

A. On the contrary, this paſſage, as I have ſhewn

---

* Marc. i. 36. and xvi. 7. † Luke ix. 32.
‡ Act. v. 29. § Luke xxii. 25.

before, proves there would be a primacy among the diſciples of our Lord. For after having told them it ſhould not reſemble that of the kings of the Gentiles, who have their own glory and pleaſures more at heart than the good of their people, he teaches them, that this primacy ſhould be ſimilar to his, that is to ſay, be tempered with meekneſs and humility.

Q. Pleaſe to quote the paſſage again at length.

A. *The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them: but let it not be ſo among you.* For this is the meaning of the words *but you not ſo: but he that is the greater among you, let him be as he that ſerveth: for am not I in the midſt of you, as he that ſerveth?* It is manifeſt, that our Lord only removes the miſtake of his diſciples, concerning the nature of this primacy; for they had imagined, that the reign of the Meſſiah would reſemble an earthly government. But ſo far is he, in this paſſage, from denying, that he expreſsly teaches, there ſhould be a primacy among them. *He that is the greater among you, let him be as the younger:* there was then to be a greater among them. And he that is the leader, as he *that ſerveth.* There was then to be one among them, who ſhould govern. *For am not I in the midſt of you, as he that ſerveth?* There was then to be one, whoſe authority ſhould reſemble that of Jeſus Chriſt, and who ſhould be under an obligation of uſing it in the ſame ſpirit of humility. The words of our Lord in another place have the ſame meaning. *He that is the greateſt among you, ſhall be your ſervant.* * The paſſage, in which the ſons of Zebedee petition our Lord for the primacy in his kingdom, is applicable to the ſame ſubject. Our Lord does not deny the reality of ſuch a thing; but intimates to them, by ſpeaking of his chalice, that this primacy was of a different kind from what they imagined; and he declares to them afterwards, that it was not deſigned

* Mat. xxiii. 11.

for them, but for another perſon. *It is not mine*, ſays he, to them, *to give you the place that you aſk for, but I muſt give it to them, for whom it is prepared by my father.** All the paſſages which I have quoted, are convincing proofs that St. Peter was the diſciple, on whom this dignity was to be conferred.

Q. Why does not St. Paul take notice of this primacy of St. Peter, in the fourth chapter of his epiſtle to the Epheſians, where he gives an exact liſt of the public employments in the Church? This ſeems more ſurpriſing, as the Apoſtle in that place ſpeaks of the means, which God had appointed to effect an unity of faith. *He gave*, ſays he, *ſome Apoſtles, and ſome Prophets, and other ſome Evangeliſts, and other ſome Paſtors and Doctors, for the work of the miniſtry, till we all meet in the unity of faith.*†

A. To reaſon in this manner from the ſilence of the Holy Spirit in ſome paſſages concerning an article, in which it ſeems it might have been a proper place to have mentioned it, contrary to other parts of the Scripture, in which this article is taught, is a way of arguing, by which the moſt eſſential parts of religion would be overturned. Thus becauſe the Angel announcing to the bleſſed Virgin the greatneſs of the favor of God towards her, uſes theſe words: *The Holy Ghoſt ſhall come upon thee, and the power of the moſt high ſhall overſhadow thee. And therefore alſo the Holy, which ſhall be born of thee, ſhall be called the ſon of God*,‡ and grounds the quality of ſon of God only on the operation of the Holy Ghoſt in the womb of the Virgin, the enemies of the divinity of our Lord conclude, that he is not the ſon of God by an eternal generation. They miſinterpret in the ſame manner, that part where the Jews are ſcandalized at our Lord's making himſelf God, becauſe he only anſwers, that the father had ſent him into the world, and that the

---

* Mat. xx. 22. 23. † Eph. iv. 11. 12. 13. ‡ Luke i. 35.

Scripture had given the title of Gods to men, to whom he had imparted ſome of his authority.* Though we be ignorant of the reaſons, for which nothing is ſaid of a doctrine in a particular paſſage, we ought to be content to find it clearly laid down in others. So that the ſilence of St. Paul, concerning the primacy of St. Peter, in the preſent paſſage, can by no means leſſen our belief in the abovementioned paſſages, which ſpeak of it in a clear manner.

Q. After having made theſe general remarks, tell me, whether it be certain that St. Paul intended to give here an accurate liſt of the offices in the Church.

A. It is certain he did not. For St. Paul does not here make the diſtinction of biſhops, prieſts, and deacons, which occurs in other parts of the New Teſtament. Would it be reaſonable to conclude from thence, that there were no deacons, who applied themſelves to the inſtruction of the firſt Chriſtians? Undoubtedly it would not, ſince it is expreſsly noticed in ſeveral paſſages.† The ſame may be ſaid, if from the twelfth chapter of the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians, in which St. Paul mentions *apoſtles*, *prophets*, and *doctors*,‡ it ſhould be inferred, that there were not then any *evangeliſts* in the Church. For the fourth chapter of the epiſtle to the Epheſians makes mention of evangeliſts, who are not named in the twelfth chapter of the firſt epiſtle to the Corinthians. So that they, who infer from the fourth chapter of the epiſtle to the Epheſians, that there was not then any chief miniſter in the Church, err greatly; for our Lord informs us, in St. Luke, that there would be in the Church one greater than the reſt, and the evangeliſts ſhew clearly, in ſeveral places, that this dignity reſided in St. Peter.

Q. What reaſon could St. Paul have for not men-

---

* Jo. x. 34, 35, 36. † Acts vi. 6, & viii. 5. ‡ 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29.

tioning the primacy of St. Peter, in this paſſage of the epiſtle to the Epheſians?

A. Becauſe his deſign in this place was to prevent diviſions, that might happen among the Epheſians, on account of the different kinds of miniſters, that were in that Church, as had been the caſe in other churches. His deſign appears in the beginning of the chapter: *I beſeech you*, ſays he, *to be careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.* * He afterwards proves the neceſſity of this duty, becauſe Chriſtians are *one body*, they have only *one hope*, *one Lord*, *one faith*, *one baptiſm*, *one God and Father.* † And then to check the ſpirit of envy, which thoſe of lower rank might entertain againſt their ſuperiors, he ſhews it was our Lord himſelf, who had diſtributed theſe gifts, and had granted to each a particular grace, that all might contribute to the edification of the Church. Accordingly he ſpeaks of the different dignities of the Church, and ſays, they are eſtabliſhed by Jeſus Chriſt, and are deſigned to prove the unity of his myſtical body: two ſolid reaſons for preventing any diviſions in the Church of Epheſus, on account of theſe different conductors. The deſign then of St. Paul confined him from mentioning any other leaders but thoſe, whom the Epheſians ſaw among them, and who only could be the occaſion of the diviſions he intended to prevent, nor did his purpoſe require him to ſay any thing of St. Peter, who, being in a particular manner the Apoſtle of circumciſion, did not go to Epheſus. ‡

Q. St. Paul hath foretold, that one day will appear, *the man of ſin*, *the ſon of perdition*, *who is lifted up above all that is called God*, *ſo that he ſitteth in the temple of God*, *ſhewing himſelf as if he were God.* What do you ſay of the application, that Proteſtants make of this paſſage to the Pope, who, they ſay, is Antichriſt? §

A. They would not talk in this wild manner, if they

---

* Eph. iv. 3. † Ibid iv. 5, 6. ‡ Gal. ii. 7, 8. § 2 Theſſ. ii. 3, 4.

attended to the Holy Scriptures. For this explanation neither agrees with this very paſſage, nor with other parts of Holy Scripture.

Q. Why do you ſay the Proteſtant explanation of this part of the ſecond epiſtle to the Theſſalonians, does not agree with this very paſſage?

A. Becauſe the man there ſpoken of will apoſtatize when he appears. But the biſhops of Rome have not apoſtatized on their appearance, as Proteſtants themſelves acknowledge. St. Paul in that place ſpeaks of one man only; whereas the Popes are a ſucceſſion of many men in the ſame chair. The Pope does not lift himſelf up above God, nor pretend to be God. We only look on him as the firſt of his miniſters. The Popes do not boaſt of being workers of miracles, nor have they ever pretended to have greater power in that regard than other biſhops of the Church. It is, in ſhort, ridiculous to ſay, that the Popes, many of whom, in the opinion of the whole world, have been ſo eminent for ſanctity, are the man of ſin, the wicked one, of whom St. Paul ſpeaks.

Q. Why do you ſay the explanation, which Proteſtants give of this paſſage, is not conſonant to other parts of the Holy Scripture?

A. Antichriſt is likewiſe ſpoken of in the epiſtles of St. John. This Apoſtle gives two characters of him. The firſt is of leaving the Church: *There are now*, ſays he, *many Antichriſts, they went out from us.* * The ſecond is of denying the Father and the Son, that is, denying God to be the Father of our Lord, and that our Lord came into the world in real fleſh. For which reaſon, in other chapters, he gives it as a character of antichriſt, that *he divideth Jeſus Chriſt*, and denieth that *he came in the fleſh.* † But the biſhops of Rome did not go out

* 1 Jo. ii. 18, 19. 2 Jo. vii. † 1 Jo. iv. 2, 3. 2 Jo. vii.

from the Church, nor ever taught theſe hereſies againſt the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt.

Q. Of whom then does St. Paul ſpeak in this place?

A. Though we could not even conjecture the true meaning of this paſſage, yet it would not be leſs certain, that ſo impious an interpretation, and ſo oppoſite to an authority eſtabliſhed in the Church by our Lord, ought never to be admitted. Nor can it be thought ſurpriſing, that we ſhould meet with paſſages in the Holy Scripture, and particularly in the prophecies, which are hard to be underſtood.

Q. Is this prophecy concerning the man of ſin fulfilled?

A. It is begun to be, and will ſtill be more fully accompliſhed.

Q. When did the accompliſhment of it begin?

A. In Simon the magician, that wicked man, who, either in perſon, or by his ſubſtitutes, oppoſed the Apoſtles in all places, wherever they attempted to preach the glory of Jeſus Chriſt.

Q. How may the words of the Holy Spirit in this place be applied to Simon the magician?

A. St. Paul ſpeaks of a thing, that would happen before the coming of our Lord. The deſtruction of Jeruſalem, before which time Simon made his appearance, has this appellation given it. In ſeveral parts of the New Teſtament, * as likewiſe in the Old, the firſt deſtruction of Jeruſalem, and that of Babylon, is ſtyled, *the day of the Lord, the coming of God.* † Moreover, the appearance of Simon the magician was accompanied with the power of Satan, with ſigns and lying wonders. He lifted himſelf up above God, pretending to be God himſelf. For which reaſon, as we learn from St. Luke, he gave himſelf out at Samaria as the *great power of God,* ‡ and of courſe attempted to eſtabliſh himſelf in the

---

* Mat. x. 23. & xvi. 28. † Joel ii. 1, 11, 31. ‡ Acts viii. 10.

Church, which is the temple of God, as if he had been the God of it. He even deluded many into an acknowledgment of his godhead in the temple of Samaria, which might be called the temple of God, ſince the Schiſmatics had conſecrated it to God. An end was at laſt put to the life of this impoſtor, by an extraordinary exertion of God's vengeance.

Q. Does the Holy Scripture ſupply any other marks, which ſhew that the words of the Apoſtle, when he ſpeaks of the man of ſin, may be applied to Simon the magician?

A. This hereſiarch had likewiſe the marks, which St. John fixes on antichriſt. He ſeparated from the Church, into which he had been admitted by baptiſm; and, amongſt other heretical doctrines, affirmed, that God was not the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which is to deny the Father, and that Jeſus Chriſt did not take upon himſelf real fleſh, which is to renounce the Son.

Q. Is this the full accompliſhment of this prophecy?

A. I have already ſaid, that it will be more fully completed. As the deſtruction of Jeruſalem is a figure of that of the world, this antichriſt is the figure of another and greater antichriſt, who will appear before the end of the world, and whoſe power will cauſe great deſtruction in the Church. But his power will at length be overthrown and deſtroyed by the glory of the ſecond coming of our Lord.

THE TRUTH

OF THE

CATHOLIC RELIGION

PROVED FROM THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.—
St. John v. 6.

SECOND PART.

THE TRUTH

OF THE

CATHOLIC RELIGION

PROVED FROM THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

THE TRUTH

OF THE

CATHOLIC RELIGION

PROVED FROM THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

PART II.

Of the real Preſence of the Body of our Lord in the Euchariſt.

CHAP. I.

Of the ancient Figures of this Myſtery.

Q. WHAT does the word of God teach concerning the Euchariſt?

A. It informs us, that the body of Jeſus Chriſt is really preſent in it.

Q. Was this myſtery prefigured in the Old Teſtament?

A. It was prefigured in the ſacred repaſts, in which the Iſraelites eat the victims, that had been immolated to God in the temple. The lamb, for example, which they eat at the paſſover, was the ſame that was previouſly offered in ſacrifice upon the altar at Jeruſalem. They alſo eat the ſacred victims, in all the ſacrifices of thankſgiving or other worſhip, in which they looked on themſelves as at peace with God. The intent of the Holy Spirit in this was to point out to us, that God being perfectly reconciled to men by the ſacrifice of the croſs, they ſhould eat the victim, that had been offered to his divine

Majeſty. And their obſervance at the paſſover ſhews us, that Jeſus Chriſt, who is our true Paſch, having been offered to God, as the ancient paſſover was, by a real immolation, men ſhould in like manner partake of it, as the Iſraelites had partaken of the ancient paſſover, by really eating it. This immolation and manducation are the two ſtriking parts of the figure of the paſſover. Our Lord accompliſhed the firſt on the croſs, and daily fulfils the ſecond in the ſacred repaſt of the holy Euchariſt.

Q. Had the Jews any other figure of this myſtery?

A. They had another in the manna. This manna came down from heaven, and the Iſraelites eat it to nouriſh their bodies. The Holy Scripture likewiſe informs us, that it was preſerved in the ſanctuary, as a memorial of its miraculous falling from heaven for this end. In this view it was an illuſtrious type of Jeſus Chriſt in the holy Euchariſt. He is there a bread deſcended from heaven, he is received into our mouths, for our ſpiritual nouriſhment in the deſert of this world, and his ſacred body is reſerved in our ſanctuaries, as a memorial of what he did on earth for our ſalvation.

CHAP. II.

Proofs taken from the Sixth Chapter of St. John.

Q. HAD Jeſus Chriſt made any diſcourſe on the Euchariſt before he inſtituted it?

A. If he had not, the Apoſtles moſt ſurely would have put ſeveral queſtions to him at the time of the inſtitution of this myſtery, either to enquire the meaning of his words, or to propoſe their difficulties concerning ſo great a myſtery. Beſides, it was the uſual method of our Lord, to ſpeak of his myſteries before he accompliſhed them. This we ſee in his repeated diſcourſes to

his disciples concerning his death and resurrection, and the descent of the Holy Spirit. That he did the same on the subject of the holy Eucharist, before the institution of it, appears from the discourse recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John. It is even most probable, that, as he found great opposition in his Apostles concerning this mystery, he spoke of it at several different times. But to be thoroughly convinced of what I have advanced, we need only consider what the Holy Spirit has pleased to tell us, in the sixth chapter of St. John, of the instructions delivered by our Lord concerning the Eucharist, previously to the establishment of this mystery.

Q. How do you know the sixth chapter of St. John is to be explained of the Eucharist?

A. Because otherwise there would be no mention of this mystery in St. John, which none of the other three Evangelists have omitted. Besides, something of great importance would be wanting in the word of God; I mean a part that treats of the effects of the holy Eucharist, viz. that close union, in which we are joined by it to Jesus Christ, and the life, which it causes us to find in him; and lastly, because it is impossible to give any other consistent explanation of the contents of this chapter.

Q. Why did our Lord make use of this opportunity to propose the mystery of the holy Eucharist?

A. He had just wrought a miracle by the multiplication of the loaves, which, of all the miracles he had performed, had the most striking resemblance to the still greater miracle, that occurs in the Eucharist, and consequently was the best adapted to prepare the minds of his hearers for this mystery. I observe likewise, that the Jews having petitioned for a repetition of the miracle of the manna, a more seasonable occasion could never present itself of informing them, that that figure was passed, and what it represented was realized in our Lord, who was speaking to them. For this reason Jesus Christ, in

this chapter, inſtructs them concerning his divine origin, the life he would give to men, and the eating of his body, which he intended to beſtow upon Chriſtians. For theſe are the chief points, in which the manna repreſented Jeſus Chriſt. He had ſaid enough to the Jews concerning the firſt of theſe points, when he told them ſeveral times, that he had come down from heaven, and had given life to the world, and when he repeated this to them, notwithſtanding the murmurs theſe truths cauſed in them. * It was then a convenient opportunity to entertain them with the laſt, that is, with the eating, by which his ſacred body would give life to the faithful, to repeat this truth ſeveral times to them † notwithſtanding any repugnance they might ſhew to it, that they might be thoroughly convinced, he was the bread prefigured by the manna, and that he might remove the deſire which the Jews, who were or ſhould become his diſciples, had of their ancient manna, and fix them entirely on himſelf.

Q. Can Catholics draw any argument from the conformity there is betwixt what Jeſus Chriſt ſays of the Euchariſt, and what had been ſaid of the manna?

A. They can. For if Jeſus Chriſt has really accompliſhed the firſt part of the type of the manna, we ought to examine whether he hath not likewiſe fulfilled the ſecond part. I mean to ſay, that Jeſus Chriſt, as true manna, ought really, and not by faith only, to be *eaten* by Chriſtians, as he really, and not by faith only, *deſcended from heaven*. In the ſecond place I ſay, that if we had only a figure in the Euchariſt, which Jeſus Chriſt ſubſtituted in the room of manna, and that he only offered himſelf to our faith, we ſhould have no advantage above the Jews. They had figures of Jeſus Chriſt as well as Chriſtians. They united themſelves to him by faith. In this ſuppoſition, the Jews would even enjoy a

* John vi. 32, &c. † Ibid 40, 48, 50, 51.

ſuperiority over Chriſtians. For figure compared to figure, there was ſomething more excellent in that of the Jews. The bread of our Euchariſt is made by the hands of men, their manna by thoſe of angels. We may likewiſe obſerve, that their ſacrifices of the lambs were more expreſs figures of the death of Jeſus Chriſt, than broken bread. If then Chriſtians have nothing more than a bare figure, the Jews would have had ſomething above Chriſtians. The legal Paſch of our Lord's laſt ſupper would have been more excellent than the Euchariſt, which he added to it. The manner in which the Jews united themſelves to the Meſſiah, by the manna, which they eat, would have ſurpaſſed the uniting of ourſelves to him in the Euchariſt, which our Lord here leaves inſtead of it. The words of St. Paul make it manifeſt, that theſe notions cannot be ſupported: *the miniſtration of the Spirit is more glorious than that of the letter.* * The Euchariſt then is a figure accompanied with the truth, and by that is infinitely ſuperior to the manna, which, however miraculous it was, had nothing more excellent in it than to be a mere figure of Jeſus Chriſt.

Q. To give theſe proofs greater force, it is neceſſary to refute thoſe, by which Proteſtants pretend to ſhew, that this ſixth chapter of St. John is not to be underſtood of the Euchariſt. If, ſay they, it is treated of here, Catholics, who believe that the wicked likewiſe partake of the fleſh of our Lord, ought to hold, that the wicked are ſaved, ſince eternal life is promiſed to the eating mentioned here. *He that eateth my fleſh*, ſays Jeſus Chriſt, *hath everlaſting life.* †

A. We plainly ſee, that the word *worthily* is underſtood in this promiſe of our Lord, as it is underſtood in other of God's promiſes made in Holy Scripture. It is ſaid, for example: *He that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved.* ‡ *Whoſoever ſhall call upon the name of the Lord*

---

* 2 Cor. iii. 8. † John vi. 55, 58. ‡ Mark xvi. 16.

*ſhall be ſaved.** *He that hath mercy on the poor, lendeth to the Lord, and he will repay him.*† Yet many will periſh everlaſtingly, though they have believed, though they have been baptized, though they have prayed, though they have given alms; becauſe they did not comply with theſe duties in the diſpoſitions that God required. The ſame is to be ſaid of the Euchariſt, every promiſe will be fulfilled in regard of thoſe, who receive in the manner that is ordained; but *they that eat and drink unworthily, eat and drink judgement to themſelves, not diſcerning the body of the Lord.*‡

Q. The Euchariſt was not inſtituted at the time our Lord made the diſcourſe related in the ſixth chapter of St. John. But he there ſpeaks of ſomething preſent, for Jeſus Chriſt ſays, in the preſent time, *he that eateth my fleſh.*

A. There the preſent is put for the future, as in many other paſſages of the Holy Scriptures. Thus in the ſame verſe our Lord ſays, *he that eateth my fleſh, hath everlaſting life*, inſtead of *he ſhall have it*; and in the preceding verſe he ſays, *Except ye eat the fleſh of the ſon of man, you ſhall not have life in you.* This manner of ſpeech is very common in thoſe parts, in which a Greek participle occurs. For example, it is ſaid ſeveral times in the Apocalypſe, *To him that overcometh I will give a recompenſe*, inſtead of ſaying, *to him that ſhall overcome.*§ The angel ſays to the bleſſed virgin, according to the Greek text, *The Holy, that is born of thee*, in place of, *ſhall be born.*‖ In the ſame manner, *He that eats my fleſh*, means in the ſixth chapter of St. John, *he that ſhall eat.* And our Lord has left no room to doubt, but that he ſpoke of the future time in this place, ſince he ſaid, *The bread, that I will give, is my fleſh.*¶

---

* Acts ii. 21. † Prov. xix. 17. ‡ 1 Cor. xi. 29. § Apoc. ii. 17.
‖ Luke i. 35. ¶ John vi. 52.

Q. In what part of the diſcourſe in the ſixth chapter of St. John, is the myſtery of the real preſence taught?

A. From the fifty-firſt verſe there is ſcarce one, in which it is not inculcated, our Lord being willing to ſet this truth in ſo clear a light, that his faithful diſciples might eaſily diſcern it, and that they, who ſhould not believe, might be without excuſe.

Q. To enter upon the proofs of what you have advanced, lay before us the words of the diſcourſe related by St. John, in which our Lord began to promiſe the myſtery of the holy Euchariſt.

A. *I am the living bread, which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he ſhall live for ever: and the bread that I will give, is my fleſh for the life of the world.* *

Q. This inſtruction appears very ſhort for the introduction of ſo unexpected and ſo incomprehenſible a myſtery.

A. The evangeliſts give us only the abridgments of the diſcourſes of our Lord. And it is certain, that, on this occaſion, Jeſus Chriſt ſaid as much as was neceſſary to make all that heard him underſtand, that he ſpoke of a real eating of his body, and to prevent any one of them from taking the word *to eat* in a metaphorical ſignification. For the evangeliſt informs us, that all his hearers underſtood he meant a real eating. He repreſents on one hand the Jews ſcandalized at the thought, and ſaying, *How can this man give us his fleſh to eat?* And on the other, his diſciples crying out in the ſame ſentiments, *This ſaying is hard, and who can hear it?*

Q. You think then, that theſe objections, made by the Jews and diſciples, prove, that the words of our Lord, which you have quoted, are to be taken in a literal ſenſe, and that he intended by them to inform us, that Chriſtians ſhould really eat his body?

A. It is manifeſt, that this univerſal agreement of all

* John vi. 51, 52.

the hearers of Jeſus Chriſt, in underſtanding by his words a real eating, is a clear proof of the true meaning of them. All the hearers of a preacher do not agree to give a falſe ſenſe to his expreſſions, where there is no common principle to miſlead them into the ſame error. Yet this would have been the caſe here, if the words do not imply a real eating, a ſenſe in which they were underſtood by all the hearers of Jeſus Chriſt.

Q. May we not ſay, that the term *to eat*, which our Lord made uſe of, was that common principle, which cauſed them to believe our Lord ſpoke of an oral or real manducation?

A. This word was equivocal among the Jews, who ſometimes applied it to the actions of the ſoul. Thus wiſdom is repreſented in the book of Proverbs, ſaying, *come, eat my bread,* * and it was in this ſenſe, that the hearers of our Lord had juſt underſtood that part of his diſcourſe, in which he ſaid, *He that cometh to me ſhall not hunger; and he that believeth in me ſhall not thirſt.* † For which reaſon they then took no offence. But as this word, *to eat*, had different ſignifications with the Jews, it was not ſufficient to determine all of them to underſtand a real eating, and particularly the diſciples of our Lord, whoſe affection for him inclined them to give the leaſt odious interpretation to his words, that they would admit. Thus, when we ſee all the hearers of Jeſus Chriſt, enemies and friends, united in underſtanding a real eating, we muſt own, that his diſcourſe was worded in ſuch a manner, that no other meaning could be given to it.

Q. Does this chapter ſupply any other proof of the meaning, which Catholics aſſign to our Lord's words?

A. There is another in his anſwer to the Jews. For there again our Lord aſſures them, that to have life we muſt eat his fleſh. Now, one of the principal uſes of

---

* Prov. ix. 5. † John vi. 35.

repetitions, is to give additional force to a truth already propoſed. Thus, in the Old Teſtament, Joſeph tells Pharaoh, that the ſecond viſion he had ſeen was only to confirm the certainty of what God had pointed out in the firſt.* And, in the New Teſtament, God three times iterates the viſion of the ſheet, filled with all manner of animals, to aſſure St. Peter, that he ought to receive Gentiles as well as Jews, into the Chriſtian Church.† Our Lord, in like manner, ſeveral times repeats his words concerning the eating of his fleſh, to enforce the truth of this doctrine, and to impreſs it on their minds, notwithſtanding the difficulties it contains.

Q. Pleaſe to explain this proof taken from the repetitions uſed by our Lord to the Jews.

A. We ſhould take particular notice, that the Jews had ſhewn how much they were ſhocked at the mention, which he had made of their eating his fleſh. When an expreſſion, introduced by a learned teacher, ſtartles us and cauſes wonder, and we teſtify this to him, if he explain this manner of expreſſion in his anſwer, it is a ſign that we had miſconſtrued his meaning; but, if inſtead of an explanation, he repeats it, and declares ſeveral times, that we muſt believe what he has ſaid, it is manifeſt, that he intends we ſhould take in a literal ſenſe the expreſſion, that cauſed our ſurpriſe.

Q. Can you add weight to this maxim, by examples taken from the diſcourſes of our Lord?

A. Nicodemus having miſunderſtood theſe words: *except a man be born again*, by underſtanding them of a carnal birth, our Lord teaches him in his anſwer, (by an expreſſion common among the Jews in relation to baptiſm) that he meant the birth of baptiſm, *except*, ſays he in his anſwer, *a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghoſt, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.*‡ In the ſame manner the diſciples having miſtaken what he

* Gen. xli. 32. † Act x. 16. ‡ John iii. 3, 4, 5.

had ſaid, in bidding them beware of the leaven of the Phariſees, he, in his anſwer, blames them for this interpretation of his words, and lets them underſtand, that he ſpoke of the falſe doctrine of the Phariſees. Again, in another place, the apoſtles having miſconceived the meaning of theſe words, *I have meat to eat which you know not of*, ſaid, *hath any man brought him any thing to eat?* Jeſus Chriſt immediately explains the expreſſion, which they had not underſtood; *my meat*, anſwered he, *is to do the will of him that ſent me.* *

Q. What inference do you deduce from this obſervation?

A. As the Jews had made it known to our Lord, that they were ſcandalized at his ſaying he would give his body to be eaten, if he had not intended to ſpeak of a real eating, he would have explained this expreſſion, and removed the difficulty in his anſwer to the Jews. Inſtead of doing this, he there repeats it ſix times in ſix verſes, he dwells upon it, he urges it in more forcible terms than before; he declares to the Jews, and confirms his declaration with an oath, that if they did not believe this eating, which was the cauſe of their ſcandal, there would be no ſalvation for them; he tells them in expreſs terms that it is real, and makes a compariſon between the certainty of it, and the certainty of his divine miſſion.

Q. What is the reply, that our Lord made to the Jews?

A. † *The Jews ſtrove among themſelves, ſaying: How can this man give us his fleſh to eat?*

Then Jeſus ſaid to them: Amen, amen, I ſay unto you: Except you eat the fleſh of the ſon of man, and drink his blood, you ſhall not have life in you.

He that eateth my fleſh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlaſting life: and I will raiſe him up in the laſt day.

* John iv. 33, 34. † John vi. 53, &c.

For my flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed.

He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him.

As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me.

This is the bread that came down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead. He that eateth this bread shall live for ever.

Q. Continue your observations on these six verses.

A. We must take particular notice, that they contain the answer of our Lord to the Jews, who had just signified how greatly these words, concerning the eating of his flesh, had indisposed them towards him. Now, let us suppose, that some Protestant, offended at the expressions used in his Catechism, concerning the receiving, verily and indeed, the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's supper, should say to one of the ministers: *How can one continue in a religion, in which it is believed, that the body and blood of Christ, which are in heaven, are verily and indeed received in the Lord's supper? It is an impossibility.* Is there one minister, who, on such an occasion, would answer in the same manner that our Lord did? Is there one who would say: *Truly, truly, unless you receive, verily and indeed, the body and blood of our Lord, you cannot be saved; his flesh is truly meat, and it is not less certain, that you must eat it, than it is, that God sent our Lord upon the earth.* Instead of thus repeating on such an occasion, the necessity of eating his sacred flesh, there is not one of them, that would not have turned himself to an explanation of the expressions, and have attempted to remove the difficulty that caused the scandal. Since then our Lord did not explain his words, it is plain, that the Jews understood them in their true meaning.

Q. Give a more ample explication of the proofs, which theſe ſix verſes ſupply.

A. I ſay, that our Lord, ſeeing the Jews were ſcandalized at his propoſal of giving his fleſh to eat, would not ſo frequently have repeated this eating in his anſwer, unleſs he had intended they ſhould underſtand, that he meant a real eating. Repetitions, in the common courſe of language, ſhew the things repeated are true in the ſenſe they are underſtood, when mentioned the firſt time.

Q. Continue your obſervations upon the ſix verſes of the anſwer made by Jeſus Chriſt to the Jews.

A. If Jeſus Chriſt had not intended they ſhould underſtand this was to be a real and oral eating, he would not have affirmed it with a kind of oath in his anſwer. *Amen, amen, I ſay to you: except you eat the fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you ſhall not have life in you.* Moreover, beſides the repetition of the expreſſion, that had given offence to the Jews, and the oath of the Saviour of the world, I likewiſe obſerve a menace. Duties that one enjoins with threats and the denunciation of penalties, are propoſed in clear terms, and to be taken in the ſenſe, in which the perſons underſtand them, to whom one ſpeaks. Thus God ſaid to our firſt parent: *In what day ſoever thou ſhalt eat of the tree of knowledge, thou ſhalt die the death.** In the ſame manner our Lord ſaid to St. Peter: *If I waſh not thy feet, thou ſhalt have no part with me.*† This eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, was a clear term, that God made uſe of, in the ſenſe underſtood by Adam. This waſhing was likewiſe a clear expreſſion conveying the ſame idea, that St. Peter conceived of it. And we do not find in the Holy Scripture, that duties accompanied with threats are propoſed in obſcure terms, which they, to whom they are addreſſed, have ſigni-

* Gen. ii. 17. † John xiii. 8.

fied they did not underſtand. Thus, ſince our Lord has added to this command of eating his fleſh, a menace of eternal damnation, we cannot doubt but the expreſſion muſt have been clear, and meant a real eating, in which ſenſe our Lord knew the Jews underſtood it.

Q. Favor us with your reflexions on the verſes, that follow in this anſwer of our Lord.

A. We ſhould remark in them, as well as in the firſt verſe, that Jeſus Chriſt there makes a diſtinction between eating and drinking; eating is applied to his body, and drinking to his blood. Which was likewiſe well adapted to ſhew, that he did not ſpeak merely of an action of the ſoul, in regard of which, to eat and to drink are not two different things. If then our Lord had intended, in this place, to ſpeak only of a ſpiritual manducation, he would not have introduced the diſtinction of eating and drinking in his anſwer; and he would, on another account, have avoided it, as he knew this diſtinction might tend to fix the Jews in the notion, which they had formed of his meaning, inſtead of undeceiving them. Beſides, nothing fell out at that time, that could put him under any kind of neceſſity of propoſing what he intended under the notion of drinking, as well as of eating. Mention had been only made of the manna; nothing had been ſaid of the waters, that flowed from the rock to quench the thirſt of the Iſraelites: our Lord muſt have been ſo far from ſeeing any thing, that could incline him to propoſe to the Jews any of theſe articles, under the idea of drinking of blood, that there were poſitive reaſons why he ſhould have rejected this expreſſion, if it had not been abſolutely neceſſary to expreſs his intentions. For, beſides the horror of drinking human blood, which was common to the Jews and other men, every one knows to what a degree this was carried among them, even in regard to the blood of animals. Hence, it is manifeſt, that our Lord never would have made uſe of this expreſſion: *Except you*

drink my blood, you ſhall not have life in you, unleſs he had really intended to give his blood to Chriſtians to drink.

Q. Is there any thing particular in the ſubſequent verſes, that confirms the proof, which you have drawn from the ſix verſes of our Lord's anſwer to the Jews?

A. The verſe, in which it is ſaid, *My fleſh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed*, is of great weight; for this word *indeed*, ſhews likewiſe, that our Lord intended to enforce upon the Jews, whom he was anſwering, the belief, that his body would really be received into the mouths of Chriſtians. In fact, this word *indeed*, or *truly*, (*verè* in the Latin Vulgate, and αληθως in the Greek,) is never uſed in the Holy Scripture, except in expreſſing ſome reality. It is true our Lord has ſaid, *I am the true vine*;* but theſe are two very different forms of expreſſion. This word αληθως, which is rendered in our verſions truly, ſurely, indeed, of a truth, is never introduced by the Holy Spirit, unleſs on occaſions where there is nothing figurative. The following examples are taken from the hiſtory of our Lord's death. *Surely*, ſaid they of the houſehold of the High Prieſt of the Jews to St. Peter, *thou alſo art one of them.*† *Indeed this man was the Son of God*,‡ ſaid the Centurion. *Of a truth thou art the Son of God*,§ ſaid the diſciples in the chapter we are treating of. The multitudes ſay concerning Jeſus Chriſt, *This is of a truth the Prophet, that is to come into the world.*‖ This paſſage alſo muſt be underſtood as expreſſing a reality: *My fleſh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.* We muſt recollect, that our Lord is anſwering the Jews, who believed he ſpoke of a corporeal eating. In ſuch circumſtances, he would not have uſed the word *indeed*, which always, in the Holy Scripture, conveys the meaning of a reality,

* John xv. 1. † Mat. xxvi. 73. Mark xiv. 70.
‡ Mat. xxvii. 54. Mark. xv. 39. § Mat. xiv. 33.
‖ John vi. 14.

unleſs he had intended they ſhould believe, that his body would be really received by Chriſtians, notwithſtanding any difficulty that might preſent itſelf againſt the belief of ſo incomprehenſible a myſtery.

Q. You likewiſe hinted at ſome remark on the verſe, in which he ſays, *As the living Father hath ſent me, and I live by the Father, ſo he that eateth me, the ſame alſo ſhall live by me.*

A. Our Lord makes a compariſon in this verſe between the reality of this eating, and that of his miſſion from above. And by this he furniſhed the Jews with another reaſon to believe, that he treated of a real eating. If he had condemned the interpretation of a real eating, which they gave to his words, he would not, in his anſwer, have compared it to an object ſo real as is his divine miſſion.

Q. Draw now a general proof from all theſe verſes taken together.

A. If our Lord had diſapproved of the meaning of a real eating, his anſwer would never have been compoſed of ſo many things, ſo adapted to ſtrengthen the idea of it in the minds of the Jews. This obſervation carries the more weight with it, as our Lord had then before his eyes not only the Jews, whom this notion of a real eating would alienate from his communion, but likewiſe ſo many millions of Chriſtians in after ages, who would underſtand his words in the ſame manner. If this meaning then was oppoſite to ſalvation, Jeſus Chriſt never would have ſaid to all, in words which the goſpel would cauſe to be heard from one end of the world to the other: *Amen, amen, I ſay to you: Except you eat the fleſh of the Son of man, you ſhall not have life in you. My fleſh is meat indeed. He that eateth me, the ſame alſo ſhall live by me.*

Q. That no difficulty may remain on this ſubject, tell me why, in all theſe verſes, one part of the Euchariſt is called the fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt, and another his blood, if,

as the Catholic Church believes, the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ, are in each of the symbols of the Eucharist?

A. Language is generally suited to the impressions, which objects make on the senses. For this reason, it was proper to give to each part of the Eucharist, the name of that thing, of which it bears the outward appearance. Moreover, the consecrated bread is designed to represent the body of Jesus Christ, and is not designed as a representation of his blood; for which reason it was aptly called simply the body of Jesus Christ, though that sacred body cannot be separated from his blood. In the same manner, the sacred cup is a representation of the blood of Jesus Christ, and not of his body. For which reason it is styled simply the blood of Jesus Christ, though the blood is not without the body.

Q. Continue the explanation of this difficulty.

A. I add, moreover, that each part of the Eucharist bears the name of what it contains by virtue of its consecration; and by the force of this consecration, the body only of Jesus Christ is present under the species of bread, and the blood only under the species of wine. And when we say the blood of Jesus Christ is likewise present under the species of the consecrated bread, and the body under those of the wine, this is not by virtue of the consecration, but because, as Jesus Christ cannot die any more, his blood must always be joined with his body, and in like manner the body concomitant with the blood. So that if the Apostles had consecrated the holy Eucharist, whilst our Lord's body was in the sepulchre, at which time the body was separated from the blood, the body would have been without the blood, under the species of the sacred bread, and the blood without the body in the holy cup.

Q. Hence it appears, that several reasons have concurred for calling the consecrated bread the body of the Lord, though the blood be likewise there, and the cup

the blood, though the body of the Lord be likewiſe really preſent, as well as his blood. But cannot you illuſtrate this ſubject by ſome example?

A. We may obſerve, that the ſame reaſons hindered the Apoſtles, and ſtill hinder Catholics from giving the Euchariſt the name of the ſoul or divinity of Jeſus Chriſt, though they both are really in the Euchariſt; theſe reaſons are, becauſe the ſenſes, to which language is commonly adapted, have no perception of theſe objects, becauſe the Euchariſt is not a figure or repreſentation of them, and becauſe the ſoul and divinity of Chriſt are in the Euchariſt, not by virtue of the conſecration, but only on account of their being always preſent, where his body is.

Q. What is the meaning of this anſwer of our Lord to his diſciples: *Doth this ſcandalize you? If then you ſhall ſee the Son of man aſcend up where he was before?*

A. One may explain theſe words by thoſe of our Lord to Nicodemus: *If I have ſpoken to you earthly things and you believe not, how will you believe if I ſhall ſpeak to you heavenly things?* * Jeſus Chriſt ſpeaks in the ſame manner to his diſciples: If you cannot believe the myſtery of the eating of my fleſh at preſent, whilſt it is yet on earth, how will you believe it when my body ſhall be taken up to heaven? Will not its abſence render it more incomprehenſible to your minds?

Q. Does this confirm the doctrine of the real preſence?

A. Yes. For if every doctrine concerning the eating of the fleſh of our Lord, which his aſcenſion does not render more difficult to comprehend, is not the doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt, it follows, that the doctrine of Proteſtants, who hold that the body of Jeſus Chriſt is not really in the Euchariſt, muſt be falſe. For certainly, ſince the aſcenſion of our Lord, there is no more difficulty in compre-

* John iii. 12.

hending what they mean by the eating of his fleſh, than there was before this aſcenſion, that is, the neceſſity of embracing him by faith. This is even become more eaſy, becauſe the aſcenſion of our Lord has freed him from infirmities, which were a great obſtacle to faith, and hath brought ſuccours to this faith, both by the miracle of the aſcenſion itſelf, by others that followed it, and by the converſion of the world. On the contrary, in the ſuppoſition of a real eating, as Catholics believe it, the abſence of the body of our Lord would be a freſh difficulty in the way of the diſciples, that would concur to perplex their belief of this myſtery. Hence it is, that Proteſtants frequently draw arguments from the aſcenſion of our Lord, to diſprove the preſence of his body in the holy Euchariſt, in which they rather ſupport than prejudice our cauſe, becauſe they ſhew by this, that our doctrine hath one of the marks of that of our Lord, concerning the eating of his fleſh, which is, that the conſideration of his aſcenſion has made it more inconceivable.

Q. What does our Lord mean to teach his diſciples in theſe words: *If then you ſhall ſee the Son of man aſcend up where he was before?*

A. He intends to intimate to them, that what he ſpoke of, would not be perceived by the ſenſes, and that as to the eating of his fleſh, it was not neceſſary, as they imagined, that he ſhould be viſibly preſent, and in his natural form, ſince they ſhould ſee him diſappear in this regard, and aſcend up to heaven.

Q. Did our Lord intend, by this anſwer, to clear up any other important truth, that related to this ſubject?

A. He deſigned likewiſe to inſtruct his diſciples by it, that they were not to form the ſame notion of his fleſh as they would of another man's, which cannot change itſelf into ſuch a ſtate as to be eaten by many, nor give life to thoſe, who ſhould be partakers of it, and that, if he taught them ſuch extraordinary things concerning his fleſh, they ſhould underſtand, when in a ſhort

time they ſhould behold this fleſh raiſe itſelf up to heaven, that it was a divine fleſh, and even the fleſh of the Son of God, of him who had reigned in heaven from all eternity, and who, of courſe, could impart an all-powerful virtue to his fleſh, and that they ought to believe whatever he propoſed.

Q. Does this conſideration likewiſe help to eſtabliſh the doctrine of the real preſence?

A. Undoubtedly. For in the opinion of Proteſtants concerning the eating of the fleſh of our Lord, it would not have anſwered any purpoſe to ſhew, by the aſcenſion of this fleſh, how much it ſurpaſſed, in power and efficacy, the fleſh of other men, which never can give life to us. Nor would it have been to any end to have ſaid, *aſcend up where he was before*, rather than *aſcend up to heaven*, for Proteſtants do not believe there is any incomprehenſible myſtery contained in it, for the enforcement of which it would anſwer any end to recal the idea of our Lord's divinity. But all theſe things were neceſſary, agreeably to the Catholic faith, which teaches that the body of Jeſus Chriſt, by an almighty power, the effect of which we cannot fathom, becomes inviſibly preſent in the Euchariſt, and gives life to thoſe who worthily partake of it.

Q. Let us proceed to examine the words that follow: *The fleſh profiteth nothing, it is the ſpirit that quickeneth.* What is the meaning of them?

A. Whatever meaning we give them, it agrees perfectly well with the Catholic faith. If, according to the opinion of many Proteſtants, we underſtand by the *fleſh* a carnal ſenſe or acceptation, and by the *ſpirit* a ſpiritual ſenſe, it is entirely conſonant with the opinion of Catholics. In reality, we give exactly the ſame explanation to Proteſtants, when they are ſo unjuſt as to impute to us the notions, which the Capharnaites imputed to our Lord. We anſwer them in the ſame manner, that Jeſus Chriſt here anſwers the Jews; we tell them that, according to the Catholic faith, the body of our Lord is in the Eu-

chariſt, not in a carnal and viſible ſtate, as the Capharnaites ſuppoſed, but in a ſpiritual ſtate, and totally incomprehenſible.

Q. Is it not a contradiction to ſay, a body can be in a ſpiritual ſtate?

A. It is the Holy Spirit himſelf, who teaches, that a body may be either in a natural ſtate, or in a ſpiritual ſtate. *The body*, ſays St. Paul, *is ſown a natural body, it ſhall riſe a ſpiritual body. If there be a natural body, there is alſo a ſpiritual body.* * If God can change our body, which at preſent is a natural body, into the ſtate of a ſpiritual reſuſcitated body, not underſtood by us, why cannot our Lord put his body into another ſpiritual ſtate ſtill more incomprehenſible, ſuch as is the ſtate, in which Catholics believe the body of Jeſus Chriſt to be in the Euchariſt?

Q. Does the Holy Scripture ſupply us with any other explanation, applicable to theſe words: *The fleſh profiteth nothing, it is the ſpirit that quickeneth?*

A. St. Paul ſays, *Knowledge puffeth up; but charity edifieth,* † to teach us that knowledge, without charity, is only an incentive to vanity. He ſays, after the ſame manner, in another place: *Paul, who planteth, is nothing; but God, that giveth the increaſe,* ‡ to inform us, that the labours of the miniſters of the goſpel, are ineffectual without the bleſſing of God. We may ſay, that our Lord ſpeaks in the ſame manner in the preſent verſe; by the *fleſh* he meant his body, and by the *ſpirit* his ſoul and divinity. And he meant to tell the Jews, that his dead fleſh, in a ſtate of ſeparation from the ſpirit, as they imaged it to themſelves, would not give life; and that thus by the promiſes, which he had juſt made to thoſe, who ſhould eat his fleſh, they were to underſtand a fleſh animated by his ſoul, and by his eternal divinity, which

---

* 1 Cor. xv. 44. † 1 Cor. viii. 1. ‡ 1 Cor. iii. 4—5.

would empower it to give life to Chriſtians that ſhould eat it.

Q. Do theſe two meanings, that you have given to theſe words, *The fleſh profiteth nothing*, add weight to the belief of Catholics concerning the real preſence?

A. That is evident. For our Lord neither here, nor in any other verſe contradicts the Jews and diſciples, concerning the eating of his fleſh. He then certainly intended they ſhould continue to believe they ſhould eat it; but as he did not intend they ſhould continue to believe they ſhould eat it in a groſs and carnal ſtate, and even in a ſtate of death, he here deſtroys that falſe notion. One of the beſt means to help us to form to ourſelves an accurate idea of the doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt, concerning this eating of his fleſh, is to embrace the idea, which he left in the minds of the Jews, and to reject that, which he endeavoured to remove. We muſt then reject this idea of a body, conſidered as dead or carnal, and as it affects the ſenſes. This is what our Lord oppoſes in the Capharnaites, when he ſays: *The fleſh profiteth nothing;* but we muſt receive, with ſubmiſſion, the faith of a *real* eating. This is an idea, which Jeſus Chriſt ſaw in the Jews and his diſciples, and which he did not endeavour to change.

Q. Can theſe words: *The fleſh profiteth nothing*, admit of any other meaning?

A. There are ſtrong reaſons for denying, that our Lord here means his body by *the fleſh*. In reality, when Jeſus Chriſt ſpoke of his body, he always ſaid *my fleſh*, and never *the fleſh*. He moreover ſays here, of the fleſh he was ſpeaking of, that it profiteth nothing, whereas he had juſt affirmed ſeveral times of his body, that thoſe who eat it, ſhould have eternal life.

Q. What then muſt we here underſtand by *the fleſh*, if this word does not ſignify the body of our Lord?

A. This word ſignifies, in the Holy Scripture, either the external viſible part of man, which is called our body, or the corruption of human reaſon. This latter

ſignification, though not ſo frequently adopted as the firſt in common diſcourſe, yet often occurs in the word of God. For example: *My ſpirit*, ſays God in the book of Geneſis, *ſhall not remain in man, becauſe he is fleſh.* * Our Lord ſays to St. Peter: *Fleſh and blood have not revealed to thee what thou haſt confeſſed, but my Father who is in heaven.* † St. Paul tells the Romans, *that Chriſtians walk not according to the fleſh.* ‡ And he reckons up to the Galatians the *works of the fleſh* and thoſe of *the ſpirit.* § The fleſh ſignifies, in all theſe texts, the corruption of our ſouls.

Q. What, according to this acceptation, is the meaning of the words *the fleſh and the ſpirit?* And how do you apply them to the words of Jeſus Chriſt: *The fleſh profiteth nothing, it is the ſpirit that quickeneth?*

A. According to this acceptation, our Lord deſigned to inform us, that the myſtery, which he here propoſes, would not be diſcoverable by the ſenſes, nor even by natural reaſon, particularly in the corrupted ſtate it is in, and that the belief of it by mankind could only be effected by the relation and inſpiration of the Holy Spirit. Thus our Lord here ſpeaks to the Jews of the eating of his fleſh, nearly in the ſame manner as he ſpoke to St. Peter concerning his divinity, when he ſaid to him: *Fleſh and blood have not diſcovered theſe things to thee, but my Father who is in heaven.* The ſame likewiſe is the import of the words of our Lord to the Jews: *The fleſh profiteth nothing, it is the ſpirit that quickeneth.* That is to ſay, the ſenſes of the body and natural carnal reaſon are not the principles, by which we can frame a right judgment of this myſtery, which can only be diſcerned by the lights, which the Spirit of God has revealed to us.

Q. Does this meaning likewiſe prove the doctrine of the Catholic Church, concerning the holy Euchariſt?

A. Since the words of our Lord, concerning the eat-

* Gen. vi. 3. † Mat. xvi. 17. ‡ Rom. viii. 1. § Gal. v. 19.

ing of his flesh, contain one of those spiritual things, which man of himself is incapable of comprehending, and which can only be discerned by the Spirit of God, every doctrine concerning this subject, which we are helped by the senses and human reason to understand, is not the doctrine of Jesus Christ. But in the opinion of Protestants, the senses and reason assist them to confirm their doctrine of the Eucharist, in which the faithful eat the flesh of the Saviour of the world, whereas neither the senses nor natural reason conduce to make us believe this eating, as taught by the Catholic Church. So incomprehensible a doctrine is received only by those, who are under the direction of the Spirit of God, and submit to his word. Here a striking characteristic, which is observable in the Catholic religion, presents itself, of the doctrine of Jesus Christ. This consideration should suffice to annul the greatest part of the objections of Protestants. *We see nothing but bread*, say they continually, *we taste nothing but bread, and besides, our reason informs us, that a human body cannot be in several places, nor even within one place in so small a compass.* There is nothing in all these words, but that flesh which our Lord rejects, as of no use towards the knowledge of this mystery. If such considerations as these could have conducted us to the true understanding of it, our Lord would not have uttered these words on this subject, *the flesh profiteth nothing.*

Q. You have said enough to evince, that these words are a vindication and support of the Catholic faith on this mystery, and very far from being contrary to it. Tell me now if the verse following that, which you have explained, contains any proof in favor of the real presence. I mean that, in which our Saviour says: *But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that did not believe.*

A. In this verse our Lord reprehends his disciples for not believing, and yet, if the Protestant system be true, they believed what they were to believe. For they be-

lieved it impoſſible to *eat*, really and indeed, the fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt, which opinion Proteſtants maintain to be true. In a word, our divine Saviour, though he knew in what ſenſe the Jews took his words, did not reproach them with miſunderſtanding his meaning, but with incredulity, in not aſſenting to his doctrine; while Proteſtants, on the contrary, condemn them, not for their incredulity, for they could not aſſent to that, of which they had no idea, but for their want of underſtanding the meaning of our Lord.

Q. Can you ſhew that your obſervation on theſe words, *but there are ſome of you that believe not*, is founded upon the Holy Scripture?

A. Whenever thoſe, to whom our Lord addreſſed himſelf, did not take his words in their right meaning, he did not reproach them for not believing his words, but for miſunderſtanding them. Thus when the Apoſtles miſtook the advice, which he had given them concerning the leaven of the Phariſees, he ſaid to them: *How, do you not yet underſtand?* * *Why, do you not underſtand that it was not concerning bread I ſaid to you: Beware of the leaven of the Phariſees?* † *Are you alſo yet without underſtanding?* ſaid he to them, in a diſcourſe, the ſenſe of which they had miſtaken. *Do you not underſtand, that whatſoever entereth into the mouth*, &c. ‡ Thus St. Luke obſerves, that the parents of our Lord did *not underſtand* the meaning of theſe words: *I muſt be about my Father's buſineſs*, § and that his diſciples *underſtood none* of the things he had ſaid of his death. ‖ But St. John neither reproaches the Jews nor the diſciples, for not having underſtood the words of Jeſus Chriſt about the eating of his fleſh. Our Lord does not tell them they had miſtaken his meaning, but reproaches them for not believing what he had ſaid to them. This makes it clear, that our Lord's diſciples, underſtanding his diſcourſe of

---

* Mark viii. 21. † Mat. xvi. 11. ‡ Mat. xv. 16. § Luke ii. 50.
‖ Luke xviii. 34.

a real eating, had in that comprehended his true meaning; and that they were deſerving of reprehenſion for not believing in this regard, what they thought was the doctrine of our Lord.

Q. What reflection have you made relative to this ſubject, in your conſiderations on the following verſe, in which our Lord ſays: *No man can come to me, unleſs it be given him by my Father?* *

Q. This is likewiſe a proof of the Catholic doctrine, concerning the eating of the fleſh of our Lord. For unleſs what Jeſus Chriſt intended to teach the Jews, concerning this ſubject, had been an incomprehenſible myſtery, he would not have taken this opportunity to make them obſerve, how neceſſary his grace was to bring them to a right faith in him. Our Lord teaches us, that the ſupernatural lights of his grace are neceſſary to enable us to believe him to be the Son of God, as he remarks in the 44th verſe of this chapter. In the ſame manner he obſerves, in this place, that the ſupernatural lights of his grace are neceſſary for us to believe the eating of his fleſh. It was not then merely the manner of expreſſion, that made the difficulty in the diſcourſe of Jeſus Chriſt on this eating. As it was not the bare expreſſion that could call any repugnance to his diſcourſe, concerning his divinity, it was the murmuring of the Jews on that ſubject, which compelled him to ſay: *Murmur not among yourſelves. No man can come to me, except the Father who has ſent me draw him;* † thereby ſhewing, that his incarnation was an incomprehenſible myſtery, for the belief of which extraordinary ſuccours of his grace were requiſite. The murmurs raiſed on occaſion of this eating compel him to ſay, in the ſame manner: *There are ſome of you that believe not: Therefore did I ſay to you, that no man can come to me, unleſs it be given him by my Father.* This eating then conveys likewiſe an

* John vi. 66. † Ibid 44.

incomprehenſible myſtery, and an extraordinary aſſiſtance of grace is required to believe it. This attention to ſpeak here of the neceſſity of his grace ſhews, that the difficulty lay in the things themſelves, and not in the expreſſions, as Proteſtants imagine.

Q. Continue your proofs, from the ſixth chapter of St. John, concerning the real preſence.

A. St. John tells us that, after this diſcourſe of our Lord, *many of his diſciples went back, and walked no more with him.*

Q. What do you conclude from this verſe?

A. I infer, that he was diſcourſing on an incomprehenſible myſtery, which, whatſoever explanation our Lord could give it, was of ſuch a nature as to alienate from him, not only thoſe, who were not yet Chriſtians, but even ſome diſciples, who had believed other myſteries, and had beheld many of his miracles. Such is our doctrine concerning the eating of the fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt: though we diveſt it of all thoſe groſs notions, which are falſely imputed to it, it is ſtill ſo incomprehenſible as to alienate from the Church, not only thoſe, who are not yet members of it, but even ſome of its children. This then is a paſſage of the greateſt importance, by which even the retreat of thoſe, who leave us, becomes a new proof of the truth of our faith concerning the eating of the fleſh of our Lord; for this receſſion evinces, that our faith has one of the principal marks of Jeſus Chriſt's doctrine, ſince one of the effects of this doctrine was, that it impeded many Jews from believing in him, and cauſed many of his diſciples to abandon him.

Q. Having ſhewn that this verſe is very favorable to Catholics, let us ſee what force it has againſt Proteſtants.

A. The doctrine of Proteſtants, concerning the eating of the fleſh of our Lord, has not the mark of our Lord's doctrine on this ſubject. We do not find in the meaning, which they give to our Lord's words, any incomprehenſible myſtery, which, notwithſtanding any explanation that could be given of

it, was of ſuch a nature, as to cauſe the diſciples to apoſtatize, who had believed in Jeſus Chriſt, had ſeen ſeveral of his miracles, and had juſt been witneſſes to the great prodigy of the multiplication of the loaves. If the ideas of our Lord had correſponded with thoſe of the Proteſtants concerning the eating of his fleſh, he might have ſtopped his diſciples with great facility, by ſaying to them, I propoſe nothing but what is eaſy to believe, I did not even mean to tell you any thing, that you have not practiſed already; when I ſpoke of giving you my fleſh to eat, I only intended to teach you, that all ought to unite themſelves to me by faith; and are not you thus united to me, you, who are my diſciples? Why then do you forſake him, who by ſo many miracles has proved, that he was ſent by God, as you have hitherto profeſſed to believe? Some words of this nature might have detained his diſciples, if our Lord had intended to enforce nothing more in his diſcourſe on the eating of his fleſh, than what Proteſtants ſuppoſe. This is another evident proof, which ſhews, that in the diſcourſe of our Lord, there was not a difficulty or obſcurity of expreſſion, as they pretend, but an incomprehenſible myſtery, as Catholics hold. Diſciples do not forſake a Maſter on account of a mere difficulty in an expreſſion, if there be nothing difficult to be conceived in the thing itſelf. Their reaſoning then muſt be wretchedly ſupported, who have nothing to allege but the miſconception of an expreſſion, when they are aſked, what thoſe weighty reaſons could be, that cauſed thoſe diſciples to break off from the Communion of Jeſus Chriſt.

Q. Is this all you have found in the ſixth chapter of St. John concerning the real preſence of the body of our Lord in the holy Euchariſt?

A. The perſeverance of the twelve Apoſtles is a proof of no leſs weight, than the deſertion of the diſciples. For our Lord does not reproach theſe fugitive diſciples for miſunderſtanding him, but for their incredulity; the diſciples that continued faithful mention their faith as

the ground of their perſeverance, and not a different manner of underſtanding the diſcourſe of Jeſus Chriſt. They do not tell him they will not quit, becauſe they underſtand his words better than the diſciples, who had juſt turned their backs on him, that they give them a different meaning, and that they ſee clearly that to eat his fleſh only ſignifies an obligation of uniting themſelves cloſely to him by faith. They do not thus ground their perſeverance on a different manner of underſtanding the words of Jeſus Chriſt, which had removed the idea ſo unſuitable to human reaſon, that alienated the other diſciples. On the contrary, their anſwer imports, that they likewiſe behold an incomprehenſible myſtery, and that they ſubmit to it as we ſubmit to other myſteries of Chriſtianity, becauſe Jeſus Chriſt, who is the only way of ſalvation, had ſaid it, and being truly the Son of God, is of courſe able to accompliſh more than men can comprehend. *Lord, to whom ſhall we go? thou haſt the words of eternal life. And we have believed and have known that thou art the Chriſt the Son of God.* *

Q. In what diſpoſition ought Proteſtants to be, on reading the different effects of our Lord's diſcourſe concerning the eating of his fleſh?

A. They ſhould acknowledge, with a holy fear, to what a degree they are inexcuſable, if they do not ſubmit on this article. In reality, one may ſay, there is no error, againſt which the word of God preſents us with ſuch powerful arguments, as againſt this error, which denies the incomprehenſible eating of the fleſh of our Lord, becauſe the word of God repreſents thoſe Chriſtians, who were the firſt engaged in this error as apoſtates and deſerters from Jeſus Chriſt. No other error has ſo expreſs a declaration againſt the firſt abettors of it.

Q. What, on the contrary, is the conſolation Catholics find here?

---

* John vi. 69. 70.

A. It is, that if on one ſide Proteſtants, by abandoning the Church, on account of this incomprehenſible article concerning the eating of the fleſh of our Lord, have the unhappineſs to ſee, that both in ſentiments and conduct they reſemble the firſt deſerters from the Communion of Jeſus Chriſt, Catholics have the comfort to ſee themſelves here followers of the example of the Apoſtles. They continue faithful to our Lord, notwithſtanding the ineffable myſtery of the eating of his fleſh, becauſe they know that Jeſus Chriſt, who is the Author of it, is the Son of God, that he has power to do more than man can conceive, and that, how incomprehenſible ſoever his words may be, they are the only way by which we can come to eternal life. Thus the diſciples, who here abandon Jeſus Chriſt, were, in ſome ſenſe, the firſt Proteſtants, that is, the firſt Chriſtians that would not ſubmit to the word of Jeſus Chriſt concerning the eating of his fleſh. And, on the contrary, the Apoſtles were the firſt Catholics, I mean the firſt Chriſtians that believed this eating, how inconceivable ſoever it might appear to their reaſon.

Q. Make a ſhort recapitulation of the principal things contained in this chapter, in favor of the real preſence.

A. We ought particularly to remark, that the Jews attributed to our Lord, when he ſpoke of the eating of his fleſh, the ſame falſe notions which Proteſtants attribute to Catholics, when they treat of the ſame ſubject; that they made the ſame objections to our Lord on this ſubject, which Proteſtants now oppoſe to Catholics; that our Lord anſwered thoſe objections in the ſame manner that Catholics anſwer them at preſent; that his doctrine on this ſubject deterred many of the Jews from believing in him, and cauſed many of his diſciples to abandon him, as that of Catholics hinders many, who are not Catholics, from being ſuch, and hath cauſed ſeveral of its children to deſert it; and laſtly, that thoſe, who, notwithſtanding this myſtery, continue faithful at preſent, are induced to it by the ſame reaſons that drew aſſent

from the Apoſtles, that is, becauſe the words of our Lord *are the words of eternal life, and he is the Son of God.*

Q. Do all theſe obſervations condemn the doctrine of Proteſtants on this ſubject?

A. Yes. For in what manner ſoever they expreſs themſelves concerning this eating of the fleſh of our Lord, it does not happen, that their hearers impute to them what they, who heard Jeſus Chriſt, imputed to him; that is, his teaching that his fleſh ought to be eaten with the mouth of the body. Nor are the ſame objections made to them, which were made to him, *How can you give the fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt to eat, this is a hard doctrine, who can believe it?* If, on their uſing the moſt expreſſive terms in regard to this eating of the body of our Lord, any one ſhould take occaſion to make theſe objections, not one of them would anſwer as Jeſus Chriſt anſwered, by repeating ſix times, and affirming with an oath, that we muſt eat the fleſh of our Lord in order to ſalvation. Their doctrine concerning this manducation never compelled any one to leave them, nor hindered any one from embracing their religion. In ſhort, if the diſcourſe of our Lord in this chapter do not appear aſtoniſhing and incomprehenſible to them, the reaſon is, becauſe they give ſuch an explanation of it as does not include any neceſſity of recurring, on this head, to the faith of the eternal divinity of our Lord, or of owing our ſalvation to a belief in his words.

Q. What concluſion do you draw from this recapitulation that you have juſt made?

A. I infer from it, that it is moſt evident that the doctrine of Proteſtants, concerning this eating of the fleſh of our Lord, has not the characteriſtics of that of our Lord on this ſubject, and conſequently is not the doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt; on the contrary, the faith of the Church, which has them all, muſt be the doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt.

Q. How clear ſoever the proofs may appear, that you have drawn from this chapter in ſupport of the real pre-

ſence, yet they do not hinder Proteſtants from attempting to anſwer them.

A. Beſides that their anſwers are very weak, I make one general obſervation on all they can here object to our reaſons, that the weakneſs of their anſwers is not leſs palpable, whether there be any appearance of probability in thoſe reaſons, or whether there be none. If the anſwers they give to the proofs taken out of the ſixth chapter of St. John, on the real preſence, have not even the appearance of truth, their error is evident: nor would it be otherwiſe, if their anſwers ſhould even have ſome ſemblance of truth, for then they would demonſtrate, that the moſt evident proofs, that can be taken from the Holy Scripture on any particular article of faith, may be eluded by ſome artifice or other, and that, on this account, it was indiſpenſably neceſſary to eſtabliſh an authority to determine the true meaning of theſe paſſages. A ſmall ſhare of ſincerity would ſuffice to make every one acknowledge, that one may produce as ſpecious anſwers to the proofs taken from the Holy Scripture, concerning the divinity of Jeſus Chriſt, as any that can be oppoſed to the proofs taken from the ſixth chapter of St. John, concerning the real preſence. Thus whenever Catholics prove any conteſted article by paſſages of the word of God, that appear very clear on their ſide, Proteſtants ought to be equally ſcandalized at, and own a defect in their religion, whether they be unable to anſwer theſe paſſages, or think it is in their power to give a favorable turn to them. They either ought to own their error in the particular point then agitated, or in caſe apparent anſwers prevent their diſcovering by theſe paſſages, that they err in this particular article, they ought to be convinced at leaſt, and avow, that they err in the general principle, and that it is not true that the paſſages of the Holy Scripture, on all the particular articles of faith, are clear and demonſtrative, if conſidered independently of any authority to fix the meaning of them. This reflection is likewiſe a means,

by which we may even reap an advantage from the moſt apparent reaſons, that Proteſtants can allege in anſwer to the paſſages of the fathers, who are the moſt expreſs againſt their cauſe. The true and beſt uſe that can be made of the verſatile ſubtlety and dexterity, that appears in their anſwers, is to take occaſion from thence of acknowledging, that human language alone was little adapted to preſerve all the truths of faith, and that it was neceſſary to join authority to the Holy Scripture, in order to determine the ſenſe of it.

CHAP. III.

On the Words of the Inſtitution.

Q. HAVING diſcuſſed the ſixth chapter of St. John, pleaſe to ſpeak of the other parts of the Holy Scripture, in which Jeſus Chriſt has taught the real preſence of his body in the Holy Euchariſt.

A. The principal is that, in which he inſtituted it. For, having taken bread, he bleſſed it, and ſaid, in plain terms, to his diſciples: *This is my body.* In the ſame manner, having taken the chalice, he gave thanks, and ſaid: *This is my blood.* *

Q. How muſt we conſider theſe words, the better to conceive the force and import of them?

A. We muſt examine them together with what had preceded, and what was afterwards to happen.

Q. What is the force and purport of theſe words, when conſidered relatively to what had preceded?

A. It is certain, that our Lord had delivered to the Apoſtles inſtructions of the greateſt importance con-

* Mat. xxvi. 26, 28.

cerning the Euchariſt before he inſtituted it, as has already been obſerved. It is moſt probable, that he had given others, that are not come to us, to confirm them in the faith of this incomprehenſible myſtery, which had met with ſo great an oppoſition, when firſt propoſed. The ſilence of the Evangeliſts cannot properly be objected here, as they only give us a part of our Lord's diſcourſes on each ſubject. There is little room to doubt, but that ſomething explanatory of this point was inſerted in the bleſſing that preceded theſe words: *This is my body*, and in the hymn of thankſgiving after communion. Proteſtants themſelves have remarked, that the Jews, on their feſtivals, commonly added ſomething on the ſubject of the feaſt to their uſual benedictions, ſo that from hence we cannot doubt but our Lord ſpake of the Holy Euchariſt, in the bleſſing, and in the Canticle after ſupper. *

Q. Since you ought only to anſwer me from the Scripture, propoſe nothing but what you really find in the Holy Scripture.

A. I then limit myſelf to the diſcourſe on the Euchariſt, which is contained in the ſixth chapter of St. John; and I ſay, the Apoſtles expected our Lord would accompliſh his promiſe, by giving them a bread to eat, that would be his fleſh, that ſame fleſh, which he would deliver up for the life of the world, and this is to be by manducation. The reality of this manducation he had confirmed by an oath and ſeveral repetitions, to thoſe, who had been ſhocked by the ſole propoſal of it; the poſſibility of it he had evinced by the miracle of his aſcenſion, and by reminding them of his divinity; the neceſſity of it he had pointed out by permitting thoſe to quit him, who would not believe it; and the belief of it he had enforced on his diſciples, by making them reflect, that

* Grot. in St. Mat. xvi. Gerhard. Buxtorf. differt. p. 310, 325. Camer. Myr. pag. 114.

their teacher was the Son of God and the giver of ſalvation. The minds of the Apoſtles were filled with theſe thoughts, when our Lord inſtituted the Euchariſt.

Q. What do you conclude from this?

A. That the Apoſtles, who expected Jeſus Chriſt would fulfil, in a manner incomprehenſible and unfathomable to human reaſon, theſe words: *The bread that I will give to eat is my fleſh for the life of the world*, and heard him, juſt before his death, after bleſſing bread with great ſolemnity, ſay to them: *Take, eat, this is my body which ſhall be given for you*, could not but conclude, (without even any other idea preſenting itſelf to their minds) that it truly was his body he gave them to eat, according to his promiſe. The agreement of theſe words of Jeſus Chriſt, though pronounced at different times, was too near and ſtriking not to be immediately perceived by the Apoſtles, and to determine them to explain the one by the other, that is to ſay, the words of the inſtitution by thoſe of the promiſe.

Q. Have you any other reflection to make on the connection between theſe two different parts of the goſpel?

A. We ought here to call to mind a rule of great importance received by all Chriſtians, which is to explain the Scripture by the Scripture, that is to ſay, to interpret the obſcure parts by the clear. Notwithſtanding all I have ſaid, were I to grant that the word *to eat* is obſcure in the ſixth chapter of St. John, ſome explaining it of an action of the mouth, and others of an action of the ſoul, yet we ought, conformably to the rule I have juſt mentioned, to ſearch for the meaning in the words of the inſtitution, where it is very clear. For every body agrees, that Jeſus Chriſt, in theſe words, *take, eat*, ſpeaks of an action of the body. The eating then, that is mentioned in the ſixth chapter of St. John, is an action of the body; it is then a real eating. After the ſame manner, the meaning of the word *body* is conteſted in the words of the inſtitution, ſome underſtanding by it the body itſelf of our Lord, and others the figure of his body. We

muſt then ſeek the meaning in the ſixth chapter of St. John, where it is clear. For all are unanimous that the word *fleſh* there ſignifies the fleſh itſelf of our Lord, *the bread that I will give is my fleſh.* In the words then of the inſtitution we muſt underſtand, by the body of our Lord, his own proper body itſelf.

Q. What is the force and import of the words of the inſtitution, conſidered in themſelves?

A. They evidently prove the faith of the real preſence. Our Lord intending to teach us, that what he held in his hands was truly his body, could not ſay it in more plain expreſs terms than theſe, *This is my body.* Moreover, we never ſay one thing is another, meaning to ſay it is a ſign of it, unleſs thoſe we ſpeak to are prepared or diſpoſed to look on this thing as a ſign. Now the bread, which Jeſus Chriſt held in his hands was not a ſign of himſelf, in any common acceptation, nor had our Lord, in any diſcourſe, prepared the Apoſtles to look on it as a ſign, ſo that they were bound, by the rules of language, to take, in a literal ſenſe, theſe words of our Lord: *This is my body.* One may add here, without in a manner quitting the bounds of the Scripture, that the Syriack verſion of St. Mark, which is believed by many to have been made by that ſaint for the uſe of the converted Jews, whoſe vulgar language it then was, or, as ſome learned Proteſtants are of opinion, was at leaſt made by ſome of the diſciples of the Apoſtles, repreſents our Lord ſaying: *Take, eat, this is my body itſelf.* * Theſe words of the inſtitution are related by St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul, whereas thoſe of the inſtitution of baptiſm are only mentioned by one Evangeliſt, as are the greateſt part of the actions and miracles of the life of Jeſus Chriſt. We do not obſerve a ſimilar exactneſs of the Holy Spirit in repeating other deeds and words of Jeſus Chriſt. This then muſt be an extraordinary

* Walton Prol. Bib. Poligl.

myſtery, and particularly worthy of attention. We ought to draw the ſame inference from the accuracy, with which the ſacred authors, who have mentioned the inſtitution, relate that Jeſus Chriſt ſaid of the bread, that it was his body, and of the chalice, that it was his blood. They who ſo frequently vary in relating his expreſſions in other places, all uſe the ſame words in the narration of the inſtitution of the Holy Euchariſt. We ſee, in all the ſacred hiſtorians, an uniform adherence to the word *body* and to the word *blood*, nor does any of them give any other explanation of theſe words. How has it come to paſs, that not one of them makes Jeſus Chriſt ſay, This is the figure of my body, or, This is the virtue of my body, or, This is my body in repreſentation, or at leaſt that not one of them adds, in the recital of the words of the inſtitution, that the diſciples then underſtood very well, that when Jeſus Chriſt had promiſed his body to eat and his blood to drink, he only ſpoke of this bread and wine, not indeed as mere figures, but as ſacred figures of his fleſh and blood. On the other hand, in regard of our Lord's diſcourſe concerning the leaven of the Phariſees, which he had admoniſhed them to beware of, one of the Evangeliſts tells us, that Jeſus Chriſt reproached them for not underſtanding him, and another adds, that after they had reflected, they knew he ſpoke of the doctrine of the Phariſees.

Q. Is there the ſame force in the words of the conſecration of the Chalice?

A. Jeſus Chriſt ſays, in the ſame clear manner, *This is my blood.* That we may better conceive the force of theſe words, we ought to remark, that Moſes, at the inſtitution of the ancient alliance, took blood and ſprinkled it upon the people, ſaying, *This is the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you.* * It is in-

* Exod. xxiv. 8. Heb. ix. 20.

dubitable, that theſe words of our Lord, uſed in the inſtitution of the new covenant, *this is my blood, the blood of the New Teſtament*, have a manifeſt relation to the parallel words of the above paſſage, and that of courſe the Apoſtles explaining one by the other, underſtood the words of our Lord in the eſtabliſhment of the new alliance, as they underſtood thoſe of Moſes in the eſtabliſhment of the old, and believed that he as really preſented to them the blood of the Lamb of God, who is without ſpot, as Moſes preſented to their fathers the blood of the victims ordained in the old law.

Q. Have you any arguments, which may be deduced from the inſtitution of the two ſpecies, to ſhew that we ought to embrace the literal ſenſe?

A. We ſhould obſerve, that our Lord was then ſpeaking to the Apoſtles, to whom he uſually declared his myſteries in open terms, and that too on the evening, in which the Holy Spirit plainly intimates he intended to confer on mankind ſingular marks of his love. * He was, moreover, then making his will, and inſtituting the moſt auguſt of his ſacraments, even that, which was particularly deſigned to maintain union in his Church. All theſe reflections ſhould convince us, that the literal ſenſe of the words of the inſtitution is the true one. A teſtator, who has the intereſt of his heirs at heart, does not expreſs the moſt important parts of his will in figurative and obſcure words, which would be apt to involve them in endleſs litigation. God, in like manner, could never inſtitute a ſacrament of peace in obſcure terms, that are only calculated to ſet Chriſtians at variance. Therefore there is no room to doubt but the literal ſenſe of the words of the inſtitution is the true ſenſe, as Catholics believe.

Q. What force have the words of the inſtitution, if we conſider them in regard to future times?

---

* John xiii. 1.

A. Our Lord foreſaw, that all the nations, of which his Church ſhould be compoſed, would firmly believe, during many ages, that the Euchariſt was his body. If he had diſapproved of this belief, and had looked on it as a ſource of idolatry, he would not, in the inſtitution of the Euchariſt, which is the part where he knew the Church would ſearch for his meaning on this ſubject, he would not, I ſay, have made uſe of words, which are of all others the beſt calculated to induce us to this belief; he would not have ſaid: *This is my body, this is my blood.* What more proper terms could he have uſed to expreſs the real preſence of his body? He rather would have ſaid, in a part ſo eſſential to the ſubject: *Here is the figure of my body.*

Q. Recapitulate, in the ſhorteſt manner you can, the advantages, that Catholics have over Proteſtants in regard to the words of the inſtitution.

A. In the firſt place, Jeſus Chriſt had prepared his diſciples to believe he would give them a bread to eat, that would be his fleſh, and never had prepared them to believe he would give them a bread to eat, that would be the figure of his fleſh. In the ſecond place, our Lord has employed the moſt proper words to expreſs the Catholic doctrine, reſpecting the Euchariſt: for he ſaid: *This is my body*; and he hath not employed the moſt proper words to expreſs the Proteſtant doctrine, for he did not ſay: *Here is the figure of my body.* The words of the inſtitution are even ſo far from being the beſt choſen to expreſs the Proteſtant doctrine, that they cannot poſſibly convey it. It is true that ſometimes a ſign bears the name of the thing ſignified, but never unleſs thoſe we addreſs are previouſly adviſed of its being a ſign. Now no intimation, as I have already obſerved, had ever been given to the Apoſtles, that the bread, which Jeſus Chriſt held in his hands, was intended to be a ſign of any other thing. Thirdly, our Lord did not ſee any reaſon in future times, that could induce him to call the Euchariſt his body, if it was not

really ſo; but he could ſee in future times, that is, in the belief of the real preſence, which he knew his Church would embrace, many reaſons to prevent him from ſaying of the Euchariſt, that it was his body, if it had been only a figure of it. Fourthly, Catholics look for ſuch expreſſions in the word of God, as may throw a light on the words of the inſtitution, ſuch as the diſcourſe of Moſes, which our Lord evidently had in view: *This is the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you*, and underſtand the diſcourſe of Jeſus Chriſt in the ſame manner, *This is the blood of the New Teſtament.* Proteſtants, on the contrary, that they may bend the words of the inſtitution to their ſide, urge particularly ſome expreſſions of the Jews, that are not found in the Holy Scripture, expreſſions which there is no appearance our Lord had in view, and which are recorded only by ſome Rabbins of latter ages: *This is the bread of miſery, which our fathers eat in Egypt* *

Q. As Proteſtants ſometimes lay great ſtreſs on theſe words of the Jews: *This the bread of miſery*, tell me whether it be certain, that they made uſe of them in the celebration of the Paſſover in the time of our Lord?

A. There is no certain proof of the antiquity of this cuſtom, neither the Holy Scripture nor the ancient books of the Jews mention it. So that no Chriſtian, before theſe latter ages, ever had the leaſt thought of applying them, as explanatory of the words of the inſtitution of the Euchariſt. Thus there is no certainty, that the Jews uſed them in the time of our Lord; it is rather certain they did not, and that the cuſtom of ſaying them was only invented to comfort the Jews under their preſent miſeries, by a lively remembrance of the miſery their fathers formerly underwent. For on reading the words, that follow in the rituals, which mention them, we find there the marks of the diſperſion and

* Ritual. Ital. & Hiſpan.

preſent ſervitude of the Jews. *This year*, &c. add the Jews in their Paſſover, after having ſaid: This is is the bread of miſery, &c, *This year we are here, the next, if God pleaſes, we ſhall be in the land of Canaan. This year we are ſlaves, and the next year, if God pleaſes, we ſhall be free.* This addition ſhews theſe words were only invented ſince their diſperſion, ſo that there is very little reaſon indeed for ſuppoſing the Apoſtles had juſt pronounced thoſe words, and that thence they explained the words of the inſtitution in the ſame manner.

Q. Though it were even a fact that, agreeably to the cuſtoms of the Jews in the time of our Lord, the father of the family had pronounced theſe words at the Paſchal ſupper, ſhould they induce us to believe the Apoſtles had recourſe to them in interpreting the words of the inſtitution?

A. The Apoſtles knew very well, that this word *is*, may, at the beginning and at the end of a feaſt, be taken in two different meanings, viz. in its obvious meaning, and in a figurative meaning, for *ſignifies*. It would not then be agreeable to ſound reaſoning, to ſuppoſe they thought the word *is* was to be taken for ſignifies, in the Euchariſtic ſupper, becauſe it had been introduced in that ſenſe at the beginning of a diſcourſe, which, according to the teſtimony of the Rabbins, who relate that cuſtom, was pronounced before they came to the eating of the Paſchal lamb. Secondly, if we credit Buxtorf, a Proteſtant, who is celebrated for his writings on theſe ſubjects, the Jews ſaid then, *Such the bread of miſery which your fathers eat in Egypt*, * or, as it is in ſome of the books of the Rabbins, *as the bread of miſery*, &c. † In theſe words we do not find the word is uſed for *ſignifies*. It is not even there at all, and if we ſupply it, being ſupplied it bears its moſt ordinary ſignification.

* Buxtorf Synag. c. 10. Daillè ſerm. 9 on 1 Cor. c. xi.
† Buxtorf diſſ. p. 293. 349. 351. 352.

Such was the bread of miſery. Theſe words then would rather tend to confirm the Catholic acceptation of the words of the inſtitution, or to ſpeak with more ſolidity, it is manifeſt, that theſe words are of no uſe at all on the ſubject of the Euchariſt. Thirdly, in another view, we may add with great weight, that the expreſſions, uſed by the Jews in their Paſſover, would rather throw a light on the meaning, the Church gives to the words of the inſtitution of the Euchariſt, than darken the evidence of it. In fact, they uſed to call their Lamb, *the body of the Paſchal Lamb*, or *the body of the Paſch*,* as we learn from monuments of a much remoter date, than any that can be produced for theſe words: *This is the bread of miſery.* We ſhould then be better authoriſed to ſay, that the Apoſtles being accuſtomed on this occaſion, to underſtand by this term, the body itſelf of the victim, they would, on that account, be inclined to underſtand by theſe words of Jeſus Chriſt, *my body*, not the figure of the body of Jeſus Chriſt, but his very body itſelf. They would be impreſſed with an idea, that as the Paſchal Lamb, after having been immolated in the temple, was eaten by the Jews, who, by that means, applied the merit of the ſacrifice to themſelves; ſo it was likewiſe the will of Jeſus Chriſt, that his body having been ſacrificed for the ſins of mankind, ſhould afterwards be eaten in an incomprehenſible ſtate by Chriſtians, who, by that action, would make an application of his ſacrifice to themſelves. Even Proteſtants have not been able to avoid obſerving the reference, the words of the inſtitution had to this cuſtom of calling the Lamb, *the body of the Paſch*, or *the body of the Paſchal Lamb*. They have even ſaid, that this alluſion to theſe words, had a more ſtriking appearance of probability, than that, which others attempted to find, in regard of the words of the

* Miſech. tract. de Paſchate, cap. ult.

inſtitution, and the cuſtom of the Jews, who ſaid: *This is the bread of miſery, &c.* * This difference is marked in a very ſingular manner. For the Holy Spirit having frequently intimated, that Jeſus Chriſt was repreſented by the Paſchal Lamb, we have reaſon to believe, that he applied to himſelf ſuch expreſſions, as were commonly uſed by the Jews in regard to this ſubject of the Paſſover. † On the other hand, there not being any intimation in the Holy Scripture, that the bread of Egyptian miſery had any relation to the holy Euchariſt, it is idle to attempt to explain the words of the inſtitution by thoſe that are ſaid to be cuſtomary among the Jews concerning this bread of miſery. However, though theſe obſervations, which we have taken up from the expreſſions of the Jews, be favorable to Catholics, yet we do not ground ourſelves on ſuch remarks, but are directed by more ſolid conſiderations, drawn from the Holy Scripture itſelf, to diſtinguiſh with preciſion the true meaning of ſo important a paſſage as that, which contains the words, by which the Sacrament of the Holy Euchariſt was inſtituted.

CHAP. IV.

Containing ſeveral other arguments drawn from the words of the inſtitution, to prove the real preſence of the body of Jeſus Chriſt in the bleſſed Euchariſt.

Q. SAY ſomething more, if you pleaſe, on the words of the inſtitution of the holy Euchariſt, as it is one of the principal articles of the belief of the Catholic Church; and as it is againſt this myſtery, that Proteſt-

* Grot. in S. Mat. xxvi. 26. Buxtorf diſs. p. 301.
† John i. 29. 1 Pet. i. 19. Apoc. xiii. 8. 1 Cor. v, 7.

ants have been at more pains to find objections, than againſt any other.

A. The paſſages of Scripture, relating to the inſtitution, are the moſt important of our religion, and therefore to explain them, recourſe ought neceſſarily to be had to the authority of the Church. But in condeſcenſion to our Brethren, who have ſeparated themſelves from us, laying aſide for a moment this authority, it is certain, that, to give a juſt and impartial interpretation of any paſſage of the word of God, great attention ought to be paid to the impreſſion, which the words of ſuch a paſſage have made on the minds of an infinite number of Chriſtians our predeceſſors; Chriſtians, who had no other views but thoſe of rightly underſtanding the words of Jeſus Chriſt; and whoſe judgment had never been biaſſed, either by prejudice or by any diſpute relative to the article in debate. Now it is a moſt certain truth, that the natural impreſſion made by the words of the inſtitution on the minds of our Chriſtian anceſtors, led them all without a diviſion, unanimouſly to the belief of the real preſence. This truth is evident, from the union of all ancient chriſtian ſocieties, who ſtill believe the article of the real preſence; an union, which ſtill ſubſiſts between people, who departed from the Roman Church as early as the fifth century, and who, in points of doctrine, of much leſs conſequence, diſſent from her communion.

Q. Continue to give us an account of the other reflections, which you have made upon the words of the inſtitution of the Euchariſt.

A. However poſitive Proteſtants may be in their aſſurances, that all the figurative expreſſions of the Holy Scripture are ſimilar to that of the inſtitution, *This is my body*, (which certainly is not the caſe, as will be proved in the ſixth chapter, by the anſwers, that ſhall be given to the objections made to the words of the inſtitution,) all Chriſtians have, notwithſtanding, been ſo fully per-

ſuaded of the contrary, as never once to imagine, that Chriſt was ever really either a *rock*, a *door*, and a *vine*, or, that *ſeed* was truly the *word of God*. And on the other hand, from the impreſſions naturally made on their minds by theſe words, *This is my body*, the ſame Chriſtians have always been led to a firm perſuaſion, that the bread, by the words of conſecration, is truly and really changed into the body of Jeſus Chriſt. And certainly, there is not the leaſt ground for judging, that the belief of an effect ſo wonderful, ſo uniform, ſo general, and ſo much above our reaſon, unaſſiſted by revelation, could have originated in chance or imagination; whilſt it is equally improbable, that the great body of Chriſtians, conſidering their different ways of thinking and acting in other matters, were not induced, by the ſtrength, clearneſs, and preciſion of the words of the inſtitution, to prove from them the truth of the real preſence, but by ſome other fantaſtical reaſon. The arguments of Proteſtants are grounded on prejudice, and a prejudice which has not even the appearance of being reaſonable.

Q. Have you no other proof to confirm what you have been juſt ſaying, with reſpect to the words of the inſtitution, *This is my body?*

A. It may be further alleged, that it is not natural, but even contrary to reaſon, that any one in his ſenſes, who does not ſee in the minds of thoſe, to whom he ſpeaks, that they conceive ſomething as a ſign, and who, without any intention to give them to underſtand, that in the ſequel of his diſcourſe, he will eſtabliſh ſome particular thing in quality of a ſign, ſhould make uſe of expreſſions, in which he gives the name of things to ſigns. Our Saviour, for example, could with propriety ſay to his Apoſtles, that he was the *rock*, the *door*, the *vine*, as he perfectly well knew, that they would apprehend ſomething figurative in his expreſſions. On the contrary, had he not known, that their minds were diſpoſed to underſtand ſuch figures, he would not have

failed to give them that explanation of metaphors, he uſually favored them with on ſuch occaſions. As therefore methods of ſpeech, in which the name of the thing is given to its ſign, neceſſarily ſuppoſe a diſtinct idea, that ſuch a thing is conſidered in the quality of a ſign, it is certain and evident, that our Saviour, when he inſtituted the bleſſed Euchariſt, could not have ſuppoſed, that the idea of any ſign was preſent to the minds of the Apoſtles. And as, without the leaſt explanation, he could not have meant his words, *This is my body*, to have been underſtood in any other ſenſe, than that of the real preſence, ſo it was out of the power of his Apoſtles to have taken them in any other natural acceptation. This truth is ſo much the more certain, as it would be offering a great affront to the infinite charity of Jeſus Chriſt, to ſuppoſe, that foreſeeing the numbers of Chriſtians, who in future ages would, from an entire deference to the ſimplicity and truth of his holy word, adopt and defend the ſenſe of the real preſence, he ſhould not have undeceived them by explications, that would have deterred them from embracing a doctrine diametrically oppoſite to his ſacred word.

Q. Finiſh what you have to ſay for the full explanation of the words of Jeſus Chriſt, in the inſtitution of the bleſſed Euchariſt.

A. If the method adopted by Catholics be both reaſonable and conducive to ſalvation, becauſe they follow the literal interpretation of the word of God in a paſſage, where the words of Jeſus Chriſt are clear and formal; if Catholics, I ſay, conceive that the words of the inſtitution of the holy Euchariſt expreſs the real preſence of the body of Jeſus Chriſt, it is becauſe they are warranted in ſo believing, by the unequivocal promiſe he made to them in the 6th Chapter of S. John; a promiſe which, as recorded by S. Matthew, S. Mark, S. Luke, and S. Paul, he made good to them on the eve of his paſſion, in theſe words: *Take ye, and eat, this is my body which is delivered for you.* On the contrary, the explanation

given by the pretended Reformers of the words of the inſtitution is unreaſonable, and expoſes their ſalvation to danger: and this, becauſe, contrary to the obvious acceptation of the word of God, they attribute to it a figurative ſenſe, an eating of his body by faith, and a virtual interior communication with this ſame body, notwithſtanding all theſe expreſſions are ſo far from being found in the words of the inſtitution, that they cannot furniſh any grounds or foundations for the ſame. This truth is ſo certain, that, were we to propoſe the figurative and literal ſenſe to a Proteſtant not led aſtray by prejudice, and the ſophiſtry of thoſe, who invent a variety of different interpretations, to deſtroy that of the real preſence; were we, I ſay, to propoſe to him, the two ſenſes together, he would embrace that of Catholics as being moſt agreeable to the words of Scripture, whilſt the metaphorical ſenſe of the figure of the body of Jeſus Chriſt, of the eating by faith, of the communication with his body by an inviſible and an interior virtue, would never even come into his mind, and particularly ſo, after reading the 6th chapter of S. John, the other Evangeliſts, and S. Paul, upon the inſtitution of the bleſſed Euchariſt.

Q. Why do you aſſert ſo poſitively, that the method purſued by Catholics is conducive to ſalvation, and that that of the pretended Reformers is exceedingly dangerous?

A. Becauſe the method adopted by Catholics is not only founded upon the expreſs words of holy writ, but is alſo eſtabliſhed by the unanimous conſent of Chriſtians, who, in all ages, have believed the real preſence, by the firſt councils, and by the authority of the Church of Chriſt; an authority which, as may be ſeen in the firſt part of this book, is at the ſame time the greateſt and the moſt reſpectable that has been bequeathed by our Saviour to mankind. On the other hand, the rules of conduct followed by the Reformers have no other foundation than their unnatural and exaggerated expli-

cations of the ſacred oracles, without any other than their own private authority, which is directly contrary to the unanimous belief of the whole Church. The reaſon is obvious, becauſe every individual is in the perſuaſion, that he has an unalienable right to examine the word of God, and to determine what is its preciſe meaning, even in matters of faith. It is moſt undoubtedly true, that the firſt Reformers, and their immediate ſucceſſors, laid it down as a principle, that the Holy Ghoſt reveals all that is neceſſary for ſalvation to every individual; and that by means of this revelation, each one is enabled, clearly to underſtand all the fundamental articles of faith. This principle of the Proteſtant Reformers is ſufficiently explained by Mr. Le Clerc, in his preface to the tranſlation of the New Teſtament. Now this is a principle the moſt dangerous, and moſt erroneous, that ever appeared in the Church; a principle, which directly tends to multiply religions to as manyfold, as there are members that embrace the reformation: in a word, a principle, which, taken in its conſequences, opens the way to every ſpecies of hereſy, that the human mind is capable of inventing; and furniſhes, in reality, arguments to the deſtruction of its votaries. For certainly, the Reformers do not preſume to think, that the Holy Ghoſt has communicated to them alone, the lights neceſſary to underſtand the true ſenſe of the Holy Scripture, which is open to all the world, and from which it is in the power of each individual, by reſpecting and receiving the ſacred oracles as the word of God, to draw from them that knowledge, which, according to S. James, is capable of ſaving our ſouls. The Socinians, the Anabaptiſts, the Zuinglians, the Lutherans, and all other heretics, whom this falſe principle has amazingly multiplied, claim this privilege with as much reaſon as any of the Reformers. Hence it is evident, to how great a dilemma all theſe people muſt be reduced; it is manifeſt, that all their religion is finally reſolved into endleſs enquiries, contradictions, and continual diſputes,

to know what party has eſpouſed the truth; enquiries, which are completely impoſſible to the unlearned, and, at beſt, very uncertain to all, who are out of the pale of the Catholic Church. For as it is certain, that the Holy Ghoſt cannot deny himſelf, ſo it is equally true, that he cannot be the author of opinions, that are in contradiction with each other. Pray, what right have the Reformers to refuſe to all Catholics, this privilege of being inſpired and enlightened by the Holy Ghoſt? To exclude them entirely from being admitted to it, will they have recourſe to their hackneyed calumnies, ſo frequently refuted, that Catholics are idolators? The world is now not quite ſo credulous, and the leading and well meaning members of their party, abſtain from ſuch falſe accuſations, which, without a ſhadow of truth in them, at beſt are only calculated to make blind and paſſionate men continue in the deſtructive errors of their own way.

CHAP. V.

In which is ſhewn the doctrine of St. Paul on this ſubject.

Q. BEFORE you anſwer the objections made by Proteſtants concerning the words of the inſtitution, tell me whether St. Paul has likewiſe ſpoken in ſupport of the real preſence.

A. He expreſsly teaches, that we really partake of the body and blood of our Lord in the Euchariſt: *The Chalice of benediction, which we bleſs, is it not the communion of the blood of Chriſt; and the bread, which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?* *

Q. Is this to be underſtood of a real eating of the body of Jeſus Chriſt?

* 1 Cor. x. 16.

A. It is. For St. Paul, in this place, compares the Euchariſt to thoſe ſacred repaſts, in which the Jews really eat the victim, that had been immolated for them, that by this means they might partake of the merit of the ſacrifice. *The bread*, ſays he, *which we eat, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord? Behold Iſrael according to the fleſh: are not they, that eat of the ſacrifices, partakers of the altar?* *

Q. What reflection ſhould we make on this paſſage, in order to ſee more clearly its force in favor of the real preſence?

A. We ought to obſerve, that the eating of the victims was the ordinary means, which God had eſtabliſhed to make men partakers of the ſacrifices. It even appears here, that this cuſtom, in regard to the ſacrifices of the true God, had been followed by thoſe, who, in imitation of them, afterwards inſtituted ſacrifices in honor of idols. This St. Paul remarks, when he ſpeaks in this paſſage of the ſacrifices offered to devils, and of the table of devils. † As to the Jews, it was their common cuſtom to partake of their ſacrifices by eating the victims, that had been immolated, as often as their ſins did not preclude them from approaching to the table of the Lord. Even in the ſacrifices, which they offered for their ſins, they in ſome manner eat them by means of the prieſts, who were their mediators on this occaſion. But all the Jews themſelves eat the victims in the peace-offerings and ſacrifices of thankſgiving, becauſe they were then at peace with God, and thus the ſtate they were in, did not make them unworthy to comply with that ordinary means, which God had eſtabliſhed to make them partakers of the ſacrifices. St. Paul then intended to make us ſenſible in this place, that the Euchariſt was a repaſt annexed to the ſacrifice of the croſs, as the ſacred repaſts of the Jews and Gentiles were annexed to the

* Ibid. 18. † Ibid. 20, 21.

ſacrifices to make them partakers of them, and in this to teach us, that we eat there the victim offered for us on the croſs, that is, the body of Jeſus Chriſt, as the profeſſors of other religions received the body of the victim, that had been ſacrificed. It is true, the ſacrifice of the croſs, is a ſacrifice for ſins; but a ſacrifice, that perfectly atoned for them. Our Lord, in taking upon himſelf the weight of our ſins on the croſs, did not continue charged with them, as the ancient victims in ſome manner were, becauſe they could not expiate them. He entirely aboliſhed them. For which reaſon, we ought to eat this victim, though immolated for our ſins, otherwiſe we ſhould not here comply with the rule eſtabliſhed by God for partaking of the ſacrifices. And we may ſay it was a rule of God's appointment, with a view to the ſacrifice of our Lord, to which every action in the ancient ſacrifices bore a reference, otherwiſe the types would not be accompliſhed. The type indeed of the ſacrifices would be accompliſhed in regard to the immolation, by Jeſus Chriſt, our Paſch, having been immolated on a croſs for us;* and would not be ſo in regard to the eating, as was done with the victims in the old law, unleſs this Lamb of God, who takes away the ſins of the world,† after being immolated, were eaten by thoſe whom he vouchſafes to make partakers of his ſacrifice. Theſe are the ſentiments the Holy Spirit intends to inculcate, when St. Paul teaches that they, who receive the Holy Euchariſt, partake of the body of the Lord, as the Iſraelites partook of the altar by eating of the victims, that had been ſacrificed, and as the Gentiles, by approaching to the table of the devils, partook of the ſacrifices that had been offered to devils.‡ The Iſraelites, according to the fleſh, by eating of the immolated victim, partook of the altar. Here is the type and the figure. Chriſtians, by receiving the Euchariſt, partake of

* 1 Cor. v. 7. † John i. 29. ‡ 1 Cor. x. 16, 18, 20.

the body of Jeſus Chriſt, which was ſacrificed for them. This is the accompliſhment of the figure. Theſe things illuſtrate each other. The portrait, the type is clear. It is agreed, that by a real eating of the victim, the faithful in the old law partook of the ſacrifice, that had been offered. We muſt then look for the accompliſhment of this figure in the new, by a real eating of the victim, that was offered on the croſs for us.

Q. Is this all, that St. Paul ſays of the Euchariſt in this paſſage?

A. He manifeſtly alludes to it in the ſeventeenth verſe, when he ſays: *We are one bread and one body, all that partake of one bread.** This is likewiſe a freſh proof of the Catholic doctrine. For it is ſtrictly ſpeaking true, that in the Euchariſt we partake of one bread. That which one receives does not, as in other repaſts, differ from that which another receives. We all in it receive the ſame bread, that is, the fleſh of our Lord, which is perfectly and entirely one.

Q. Is this the only paſſage, in which St. Paul has ſpoken of the Euchariſt?

A. He ſpeaks of it likewiſe in the next chapter, where, in order to convince the Corinthians of the enormity of their ſin, in ſhewing ſo little reſpect to this auguſt ſacrament, he recalls to their remembrance that our Lord, having bleſt the bread and the chalice of the Holy Euchariſt, ſaid: *This is my body, this is my blood*, and announces to them, that the unworthy communicant is guilty of the body itſelf, and the blood of the Lord, and that he receives his own condemnation, becauſe he is not attentive that it is the body of the Lord, or, to uſe the Apoſtles own words, becauſe he *does not diſcern the body of the Lord.* †

Q. Draw a general concluſion from all the proofs

---

* Ibid. 17. † 1 Cor. xi. 24, 27, 29.

found in the Holy Scripture, for the real preſence of the body of Jeſus Chriſt in the Holy Euchariſt.

A. From them we muſt conclude, that there is not any particular article of faith more clearly revealed in the Holy Scripture than this truth, God having thought proper to diſtinguiſh, by more abundant lights, a myſtery ſo incomprehenſible in itſelf, and which would one day be oppoſed with ſuch vehemence. For which reaſon, thoſe, who will not ſubmit to believe it, ought to dread that they will at leaſt be as inexcuſable at the day of judgment, as thoſe who have preſumed to deny the other articles of faith revealed in the Holy Scriptures.

CHAP. VI.

Which contains the anſwer to the principal objections, which Proteſtants bring againſt the arguments deduced from the words of the Inſtitution.

Q. THAT we may now ſolve the objections againſt the real preſence, which Proteſtants draw from the Holy Scripture; I will firſt propoſe their difficulties on the words of the inſtitution. What do you think of the ſubtilities, by which their teachers endeavour to prove, that Jeſus Chriſt could not intend to change the bread into his body, when he pronounced the words of the inſtitution? For example, they ſay that theſe words, *This is my body*, cannot prove the opinion of Catholics, becauſe according to them, the word *this*, can neither mean the *bread*, ſince we cannot ſay, the bread is the body of Jeſus Chriſt, nor the *body of Jeſus Chriſt*, becauſe the words of the conſecration not being completed, the body of Jeſus Chriſt could not be yet in the Euchariſt.

A. It is unbecoming a Chriſtian, or any man of ſenſe, to have recourſe to ſuch chicanery about words. To make this evident, I will quote the paſſage, in which

St. John ſays, *When the chief ſteward had taſted the water made wine,* * and that where St. Luke ſays of St. John, *The child grew, and was ſtrengthened in ſpirit; and was in the deſerts until the day of his manifeſtation to Iſrael.* † It would be abſurd to condemn theſe expreſſions, becauſe that, which was contained in the veſſels of the chief ſteward, was no longer water, and becauſe St. John was no longer a child, when he lived in the deſerts. Sophiſtry of this kind, for which there would frequently be room, if every word of a diſcourſe were narrowly examined, is particularly inconſiſtent in regard to paſſages, that mention any miracle wrought by Almighty God. Such are theſe: *Go thy way, thy ſon liveth.* ‡ *Lazarus come forth.* § *Tabitha ariſe.* ‖ He would be looked on as a trifler, that ſhould object againſt theſe expreſſions, by obſerving, that the ſon of the ruler, Lazarus and Dorcas did not exiſt till the ſentence was entirely finiſhed, as it was not till then that their ſouls were united to their bodies. It is not neceſſary to make an inquiry into the preciſe moment when theſe reſurrections were effected, nor to examine in detail, the ſignification of each word in every particular inſtant. It is ſufficient, that we believe Jeſus Chriſt really effected the miracles, which the words expreſs. In like manner, without concerning ourſelves about the particular moment, in which the bread is changed into the body of Jeſus Chriſt, and without a minute enquiry into the ſignification of theſe words, *This is my body*, in regard to the different inſtants of time, that precede and are ſubſequent to the change, it is ſufficient for the verification of the ſenſe, which the Church gives to theſe words, that the conſecrated Euchariſt is truly the body of Jeſus Chriſt.

Q. May it not be ſaid, that it is not ſurpriſing, that our Lord uſed, in the words of the inſtitution, the word

---

* John ii. 9. † Luke i. 80. ‡ John iv. 50.
§ John xi. 43. ‖ Acts ix. 40.

is, for *ſignifies*, becauſe the Hebrews have no term correſponding to that of ſignifies, and that thus our Lord intending to teach, that the bread was a ſign of his body, ought, according to their idiom, to ſay, *This is my body?*

A. The bare reading of the Holy Scripture is ſufficient to ſhew the futility of this remark; for it is common to find there, ſigns called ſigns of the things they repreſent. Thus the rainbow is more than once called, *the ſign of the covenant of God. I will ſet my bow in the clouds, and it ſhall be the ſign of a covenant between me and between the earth. God ſaid to Noah: this ſhall be the ſign of the covenant, which I have eſtabliſhed between me and all fleſh upon the earth.* * In the ſame manner, when God ordained circumciſion, he ſaid to Abraham, *You ſhall circumciſe the fleſh, that it may be for a ſign of the covenant between me and you.* † St. Paul likewiſe gives circumciſion the name of *ſign*. *Abraham*, ſays he, *received the ſign of circumciſion, as a ſeal of the juſtice of faith.* ‡ Moſes, in this manner, uſually gave the name of *ſign* to things, that were intended to be repreſentations of other things. For this reaſon, this name is given in Exodus to the Sabbath, and to the blood, with which the Iſraelites ſprinkled the tranſoms of their doors. §

Q. Make an application of this remark to the preſent ſubject.

A. Since it is ſo common in holy writ, to give this name of *ſign* to figures, that God eſtabliſhes, how comes it to paſs, that our Lord never ſays of the Euchariſt, that it is the ſign of his body, if he only intended to inſtitute a mere figure of it? Why, at leaſt in the eſtabliſhment of ſo auguſt a ſacrament, does not Jeſus Chriſt ſay, *this ſhall be the ſign of my body?* as God ſaid to Noah, when he appointed the rainbow for a ſign: *This ſhall be the ſign of a covenant between me and the earth.*

---

* Gen. ix. 12, 13, 17. † Gen. xvii. 11. ‡ Rom. iv. 11.
§ Exod. xxxi. 13, and xii. 13.

And to Abraham in the inſtitution of circumciſion: *This circumciſion ſhall be a ſign of the covenant that ſhall be between you and me.* Our Lord having declined to apply this word *ſign*, ſo common in the Holy Scripture, to the Euchariſt, either when he inſtituted it, or at any other time, gives us an evident mark of his intention, that Chriſtians ſhould look on it, not as a mere figure of his body, but as his body itſelf.

Q. I proceed now to the proof theſe Gentlemen draw from our Lord's words, in the celebration of the holy Euchariſt, to ſhew it is not unreaſonable, as you have ſaid, to look for a figure in the words of the inſtitution. Catholics themſelves ſay, they own there is one or two figures in this verſe: *I will not drink from henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day, when I ſhall drink it new in the kingdom of my Father.* *

A. Theſe words are not in the eſſential part of the inſtitution. Now, though a teſtator be particularly on his guard in expreſſing his intention, with the greateſt perſpicuity, in that part of his will, in which he diſpoſes of his eſtate, he is not equally accurate in regard to other expreſſions, that may be found in the will. †

Q. But theſe words, *This is the chalice of the New Teſtament*, occur in the eſſential part of the inſtitution, as well as theſe, *This is my body.* Yet we have here two figures, the chalice ſignifies that which it contains, and this is called the New Teſtament, becauſe it is the ſeal of it.

A. Theſe figures are as clear as the moſt literal expreſſions, becauſe the Apoſtles were accuſtomed to the familiar uſe of them. Every one ſays this glaſs, this cup, meaning the contents of it. They knew likewiſe,

---

* Mat. xxvi. 29. Luke xxii. 18.

† Moreover, theſe words, according to St. Luke, were not ſpoken of the ſacramental cup, but of the wine, that was drunk with the Paſchal Lamb. Vid. Luke xxii. 18.

that covenants ought to be confirmed by ſome viſible ſign, that ſhould be the ſeal of them, and that the blood of ſome victim was commonly uſed on theſe occaſions. The Jews, in particular, were poſſeſſed with this notion, who ſaw in the writings of Moſes how he ſprinkled the blood of the victims upon the people, and ſaid to them, *This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you.* As the Apoſtles were filled with theſe ideas, it was manifeſt to them, that when our Lord ſaid, *This is the chalice, the New Teſtament in my blood*, he meant by the *chalice* the blood contained in it, and that this blood was the miraculous ſeal, by which God intended to ſeal this admirable evangelical covenant. Theſe figures then were properly introduced by Jeſus Chriſt, as they were as clear to the Apoſtles, whoſe minds were full of theſe thoughts, as the plaineſt terms would have been. But the uſe of ſuch clear figures could never authorize that of one ſo obſcure, as would have been contained in theſe words, *This is my body*, if they were to be taken in a figurative ſenſe.

Q. Why would theſe words have been an obſcure figure?

A. It is contrary to the rules of language, and without a precedent in the Holy Scripture, to give a ſign the name of the thing ſignified, when thoſe we addreſs are not prepared to look on it as a ſign. Now the Apoſtles were not prepared to look on the bread, which they beheld, as the ſign of our Lord's body. It was not evident to them, when they looked on our Lord's body, that it was neceſſary to eſtabliſh a ſign to repreſent it, nor, when they looked on the bread, which Jeſus held in his hand, that it could be deſigned to be a figure of his ſacred body. Nor had our Lord ever prepared them by any previous diſcourſe to entertain ſuch a thought; for he never had declared he would one day give them bread, that ſhould be the figure of his body; he had on the contrary told them, that the bread he would give, ſhould be his own fleſh, which he would deliver for the

life of the world.* Thus, as they had not then any reaſon to imagine, that Jeſus Chriſt would give this bread to be a figure of his body, it would have been the moſt obſcure figure imaginable to ſay to them, ſuddenly, and without any notice concerning the bread he held in his hands, *This is my body*, meaning to teach them it was a ſign of it.

Q. Finiſh this argument.

A. The figure then which Proteſtants look for in theſe words: *This is my body*, would have been at that time exceedingly obſcure and unintelligible. And it is in this view, I have ſaid it is detracting from the glory of Jeſus Chriſt, to ſuppoſe he would have uſed it at the time, in which he ſpoke them to his Diſciples. For when the Holy Ghoſt repreſents him as earneſtly deſiring to give them the moſt tender marks of his love, he would not have been obſcure in the moſt eſſential clauſe of his will, in the inſtitution of the moſt auguſt of his ſacraments, of that, which he deſigned in a more particular manner to be a ſource of conſolation to our ſouls, and a band of peace and union among Chriſtians.

Q. That we may proceed to another objection, I will lay before you that argument, which Proteſtants draw from theſe words, which our Lord added to thoſe of the inſtitution juſt mentioned: *Do this for a commemoration of me.* We do not make a commemoration of a thing that is preſent: for which reaſon, if the body of Jeſus Chriſt had been preſent in the Euchariſt, he would not have propoſed it as a memorial.

A. The Evangeliſts were ſo far from imagining, that the explication of theſe words: *This is my body*, depended on theſe others: *Do this for a commemoration of me*, that the latter are not even mentioned either by St. Matthew, or St. Mark, who are the firſt, that left in writing the words of the inſtitution of the Holy

---

* John vi. 52.

Euchariſt. In reality it is clear they are not inſerted to explain theſe words, *Take, eat, this is my body;* but to point out the diſpoſition of mind, in which we ought to perform the action, which Jeſus Chriſt had juſt ordained, that is, of receiving and eating his body.

Q. Continue the refutation of this objection.

A. Proteſtants are unable to prove from the Holy Scripture, that one cannot, as they ſay, make a commemoration of an object, that is preſent; neither does reaſon oppoſe it. It would indeed be abſurd to exhort a perſon, that has good eyes, to call to his remembrance a viſible object, that preſented itſelf to him, as on ſeeing the object an idea of it would neceſſarily be formed in his mind; but when an object, though preſent, does not ſtrike the ſenſes, one may, without the leaſt impropriety, exhort others to think on it, and call it to their minds, becauſe as ſuch a preſence does not fall under the ſenſes, there is not always an idea of the object formed in the mind. Hence no one ever thought of blaming thoſe, who exhort us to remember our ſouls, the Angels, or God, though theſe objects be preſent. So far from it, their preſence itſelf is a conſideration, that obliges us to exhort mankind to be mindful of them. It is not then improper to incite Chriſtians to remember Jeſus Chriſt in the celebration of the Holy Euchariſt, though he be there preſent. We are on the contrary more ſtrictly bound to think of him, becauſe he is there preſent, and of courſe our obligation is more indiſpenſable of exhorting Chriſtians to reflect on him. As Jeſus Chriſt is not there preſent in a ſenſible manner, man would frequently fall into a criminal inattention, unleſs roufed by ſuch an exhortation.

Q. Have we any example in the Holy Scripture, in which ſigns are images and memorials of things preſent?

A. Moſes often calls a part of the ancient offerings a *memorial*, though the offerings were preſent.* The

* Levit. i.

Dove, that deſcended upon our Lord,* and the tongues of fire, that appeared to the Apoſtles,† were ſigns of the Holy Ghoſt then preſent. Jeſus Chriſt himſelf is called *the image of God and the figure of his ſubſtance;* ‡ yet he ſays: *The Father is in me, and I in the Father.* § Why then may not the Euchariſt be a ſign and memorial of the body of Jeſus Chriſt, though preſent?

Q. Have you any other anſwer to the objection, which is drawn from theſe words: *Do this in commemoration of me?*

A. I even ſay, it is not true, that the thing to be commemorated in the Holy Euchariſt, is there preſent. In effect St. Paul explains the commemoration recommended by our Lord, of the commemoration of his death: *As often as you ſhall eat this bread, and drink this chalice, you ſhall ſhew the death of the Lord.* ‖ Now the death of Jeſus Chriſt is not a thing preſent in the Holy Euchariſt, but is only repreſented in it.

Q. Are there in the word of God, any ſuch examples of memorials, as may ſerve to ſhew, that our Lord's body, in the Euchariſt, may be a memorial of this ſame body, that was before immolated on the croſs?

A. The manna, that was preſerved in the ark, was a memorial of the ſame manna, which had fallen in the deſert, to feed the Jews. ¶ Aaron's rod, which was likewiſe preſerved in it, was a memorial of this ſame rod, with which Moſes had once wrought ſo many miracles. All the victims, that the Iſraelites eat in their ſacred repaſts, were memorials of theſe ſame victims offered on the altar.

Q. What do you infer from thence?

A. I infer, that there is not any impropriety in ſaying, that our Lord's body in the Euchariſt is a memorial of this ſame body, conſidered as hanging on a croſs.

---

* Mat. iii. 16. † Acts ii. 3. ‡ 2 Cor. iv. 4. and Heb. i. 3.
§ John x. 38. ‖ 1 Cor. xi. 26. ¶ Exod. xvi. 42.

I even infer from thence, that theſe words, *do this for a commemoration of me*, favor the belief of the real preſence. In fact, he does not ſpeak there of a mere commemoration, but of the commemoration of a ſacrifice. Now in the repaſts, where they made the commemoration of the ſacrifices, and the application of them, the victim itſelf, that had been immolated, was always preſent. The body then of Jeſus Chriſt, our victim, ought to be preſent in the commemorative repaſt of his bloody ſacrifice.

Q. Does it appear from the Holy Scripture, in regard to our Lord's body, that it can be a figure of itſelf conſidered in a different ſtate?

A. One may ſay, that our Lord's body covered with the waters of the Jordan, and emerging from the river, repreſented his burial and reſurrection from the grave. All agree that this body, when transfigured upon Mount Thabor, was a figure of this ſame body, glorified in heaven. Why may not the body of Jeſus Chriſt, covered with the appearances of his death, which are the ſacred ſymbols, be adapted to repreſent this ſame body delivered up to death, as this body clothed with the appearances of glory, was a ſtriking repreſentation of the ſame body, in a ſtate of celeſtial glory?

Q. Cannot you without recurring to other parts of the Holy Scripture, refute by theſe words, *do this for a commemoration of me*, the objection Proteſtants find in them.

A. Yes. For ſince Jeſus Chriſt, though viſibly preſent, exhorts his Apoſtles to communicate with the remembrance of him, this commemoration, according to Jeſus Chriſt, is not oppoſite to his preſence, not even his viſible preſence. It is then a great error to ſuppoſe, that this remembrance is inconſiſtent with the inviſible preſence of the body of Jeſus Chriſt, which Catholics hold.

Q. If our Lord's body were really preſent in the Holy Euchariſt, it would follow, that this ſacred body was in

that of Judas, and that even at a time, in which the Holy Scripture informs us, that *Satan entered into him.* * Is not this exceedingly inconſiſtent?

A. The Holy Scripture does not clearly aſſert, that Judas communicated; but though it had been ſo, there would not be any inconſiſtency. As there is none in ſaying, that the eſſence of God is in the wicked, ſo there is none in aſſerting, that our Lord's body is in the wicked, in that ſpiritual and impaſſible ſtate, in which he is in the Euchariſt. All Chriſtians believe that this ſacred body, when in a corporeal and paſſible ſtate, was ſet by the devil on the pinnacle of the temple. † We need have much leſs difficulty in believing, that in that myſterious incomprehenſible ſtate, in which he is in the the Euchariſt, he may be in the bodies of the wicked.

Q. If the Apoſtles had thought our Lord really gave them his body to eat, they would have propoſed ſome difficulties concerning ſo incomprehenſible a myſtery, as we ſee in the Goſpel they did concerning ſome other diſcourſes of Jeſus Chriſt, which they could not underſtand. ‡

A. They did this concerning the Euchariſt, the firſt time our Lord mentioned it to them, as we ſee in the ſixth chapter of St. John. But our Lord having then given a full anſwer to all their objections, and having declared there was no ſalvation for thoſe, who rejected this eating, and having permitted thoſe to depart, who would not believe this myſtery, the Apoſtles did not think of renewing their difficulties, when our Lord inſtituted the Holy Euchariſt.

Q. May not theſe words, *this is my body*, be underſtood in the ſame manner, with the following, *I am the door*, *I am the vine?* §

A. We find ſeveral differences between theſe things in

---

* John xiii. 27. † Mat. iv. 5. 8. ‡ Mat. xiii. 36. Mat. xv. 15.
§ John x. 7. and xv. 1.

the Holy Scripture, that ſhould hinder us from making a compariſon between them.

Q. Explain the firſt of theſe differences.

A. Nothing prepared the Apoſtles to believe our Lord ever intended really to become a vine, or a door. But expreſs diſcourſes made by Jeſus Chriſt concerning the eating of his fleſh, with all that happened at the time, led them to underſtand, that he would give them bread to eat, that would be his body.

Q. What is the ſecond difference of theſe expreſſions?

A. It is, that in theſe propoſitions, *I am the vine*, *I am the door*, there is nothing more than a very common metaphor, which every one is always prepared to underſtand. For it is very common thus to aſſimilate thoſe things to oneſelf, the peculiar qualities of which are adapted to repreſent thoſe we poſſeſs. Moreover, our Lord immediately mentioned the quality of theſe things, that had induced him to apply them to himſelf. If he ſays, *I am the door*, he inſtantly ſhews the reaſon of it to be, becauſe we muſt enter by a communication with him into the Church, which is the true ſheepfold. If he ſays, *I am the vine*, he at the ſame time ſubjoins the reaſon, becauſe we cannot ſubſiſt out of his communion. In the ſame manner as the branches of a vine wither for want of nouriſhment, as ſoon as they are ſeparated from the vine, ſo Chriſtians cannot ſubſiſt ſpiritually if cut off from him. Thus the figure contained in theſe ſentences, *I am the vine*, *I am the door*, was very clear and proper to be uſed by Jeſus Chriſt. The ſame cannot be ſaid of that, which would be contained in this propoſition: *This is my body*, if our Lord had intended the Apoſtles ſhould underſtand him in a metaphorical ſenſe. Propoſitions, in which the ſign bears the name of the thing ſignified being much more uncommon, than thoſe in which one calls oneſelf by the name of things, to which one has ſome reſemblance. The mind is not prepared for them, ſo that they are not made uſe of, unleſs at leaſt one be previouſly informed that theſe ſigns have

been eſtabliſhed to repreſent particular things. Such a propoſition cannot then be introduced into the firſt eſtabliſhment of a ſign, it would be unintelligible at ſuch a time, to ſay nothing worſe of it. For it can only be in jeſt, or to puzzle others, that one may ſometimes ſay one thing is another, meaning it ſignifies it, when they have been told that we ſpeak of a ſign. Unleſs, for example, it had been known that Daniel was interpreting the dream of the king of Babylon, he could not have begun his diſcourſe by ſaying, *A tree is a man*, &c. The mind is quite unprepared for ſuch figures. In the ſame manner, as the Apoſtles were not prepared to believe our Lord intended to make bread the ſign of his body, it would have been unbecoming the wiſdom of Jeſus Chriſt, to have begun ſuch an eſtabliſhment, by ſaying, the bread he held was his body. Beſides, as I have proved already, our Lord makes no addition, that ſhews clearly, that by theſe words: *This is my body*, he intended to eſtabliſh a figure of his body. No compariſon then can be drawn betwixt the figure contained in theſe words: *I am the door*, *I am the vine*, and that, which the pretended Reformers attempted to find in the words of the inſtitution of the Holy Euchariſt: *This is my body*.

Q. Which is the third difference betwixt theſe expreſſions of the Saviour of the world?

A. He did not foreſee, that all the Church would believe he really was a *vine*, or a *door*. If he had, his charity and wiſdom would have induced him to have rejected theſe expreſſions. He even knew, that no Chriſtian would adopt ſo ſtrange a notion, and that of courſe there was no inconvenience in his expreſſing the neceſſity of approaching, and being united to him by theſe words, *I am the door*, *I am the vine*. On the other hand, our Lord foreſaw, that all the Church would believe the Euchariſt to be truly his body. So that if he had not approved of that belief, he would undoubtedly have avoided an expreſſion ſo fitted to confirm it as this is: *This is my body*.

Q. Is there any other difference betwixt theſe expreſſions?

A. I ſay laſtly, that we do not find, when our Lord ſpoke theſe words, *I am the vine*, that any one preſent ſignified to him they were ſcandalized; that at this, he repeated the expreſſion, and affirmed with an oath, that he really was a *vine*; that this cauſed many of his diſciples to quit him in diſguſt at his doctrine, and that the twelve Apoſtles were only withheld from doing the ſame, by the conſideration of his divinity, and the neceſſity of believing his words. All theſe things happened on our Lord's uſing this expreſſion: *The bread that I will give to eat, is my fleſh*, as I have obſerved on the fixth chapter of St. John.

Q. May not one underſtand theſe words: *This is my body*, in the ſame manner as the following: *the rock was Chriſt*? *

A. This paſſage is very ineffectually quoted by Proteſtants, as a foundation of the meaning they give to the words of the inſtitution. For it is not even clear that the word *is*, is to be taken for ſignifies in theſe words: *And the rock was Jeſus Chriſt. Our Fathers*, ſays St. Paul, *drank of the ſpiritual rock, that followed them: and the rock was Jeſus Chriſt.* And is not Jeſus Chriſt *really that ſpiritual rock*, of which the Iſraelites drank? The material rock Horeb, was only the figure of Jeſus Chriſt; but the ſpiritual rock repreſented by it was Jeſus Chriſt. And it is of this rock St. Paul ſpeaks, when he ſays: *The rock was Jeſus Chriſt*, or *Jeſus Chriſt was the rock.*

Q. In the ſuppoſition, that St. Paul ſpeaks here of the rock Horeb, and that theſe words; *the rock was Jeſus Chriſt*, mean that this rock repreſented Jeſus Chriſt, could Proteſtants, with any degree of plauſibility, apply this paſſage as an explanation of that, in which the Euchariſt is called the body of Jeſus Chriſt?

---

* 1 Cor. x. iv.

A. We are not authoriſed by any thing in Holy Scripture to explain one of theſe paſſages by the other. Nothing but the imagination and prepoſſeſſion of our opponents could have induced them to make this paſſage, *the rock was Jeſus Chriſt*, the baſis of the explanation, which they give to the words of the inſtitution of the Holy Euchariſt. And we may even ſee in the Holy Scripture, that the words of the inſtitution cannot admit a figurative ſenſe, as theſe can: *The rock was Jeſus Chriſt.*

Q. Why not?

A. We may here call to mind all I have hitherto advanced, in order to prove, that we cannot find a figurative meaning in the words, *this is my body*, as in theſe: *I am the vine.* So that I will content myſelf with ſaying here, that St. Paul knew that all thoſe, to whom he wrote, were convinced that the rock of Horeb was only a figure of the Meſſiah. Whence he ſaw evidently that this expreſſion; *the rock was Jeſus Chriſt*, would be univerſally underſtood in a figurative ſenſe. Beſides St. Paul had juſt ſhewn in the preceding verſes, that he was treating of myſterious ſigns. He had propoſed the cloud and the paſſage of the red ſea, as a figure of baptiſm. He had there propoſed the manna and the water of Horeb, as a figure of the bread and chalice of the Holy Euchariſt. He had even with this view, there called the manna, a *ſpiritual food*, and the water of the rock, a *ſpiritual drink*. By this he plainly ſhewed the Corinthians, that he conſidered the rock as a myſterious ſymbol, as a repreſentation of ſomething elſe. Theſe words, *the rock was Jeſus Chriſt*, following immediately after, could not be underſtood in any other but in a figurative ſenſe, to which the preceding words were a natural introduction. There is not any thing of this kind in the words of the Inſtitution. The Apoſtles had never been accuſtomed to look on bread as a ſign of the body of Chriſt; nor is there any previous diſcourſe, in which Jeſus Chriſt evidently points out, that he intends to ſpeak only

of a myſterious ſign. For which reaſon it cannot be ſaid, that theſe words, *this is my body*, might ſignify to the Apoſtles, that the Euchariſt was only a figure of Jeſus Chriſt, in as evident a manner as theſe, *the rock was Jeſus Chriſt*, could repreſent to the Corinthians, that the rock of Horeb was a figure of Jeſus Chriſt.

Q. Have you any thing to add on this paſſage?

A. I add, that one ought rather to look on it as a confirmation of the literal acceptation. For, as St. Paul could have expreſſed his thoughts concerning the rock of Horeb, either by ſaying: *The rock was a figure of Jeſus Chriſt*; or by ſaying, *The rock was Jeſus Chriſt*; it is manifeſt he choſe the latter expreſſion, becauſe he intended to compare this rock to the holy Euchariſt. He knew the Euchariſt to be the body of Jeſus Chriſt, and that thus the compariſon of the rock to the holy Euchariſt, would be ſtronger and more lively, by his ſaying, *this rock was Jeſus Chriſt*. It is in this manner, that our Lord, intending to compare the concord, that ought to be found among Chriſtians, to his union with the Father, expreſſes this unity in words the moſt proper to repreſent that of the eternal Father and Jeſus Chriſt. *That they may be one*, ſays he, *as we alſo are one*. St. Paul alſo, meaning to compare the death of Jeſus Chriſt to the myſtical death of the faithful, who renounce ſin, ſays, Jeſus Chriſt *died to ſin*. It is common, in making a compariſon of two things, to repreſent one by a form of words beſt ſuited to repreſent the other, though the expreſſion, if rigorouſly examined, agree to them in a very different manner. For this reaſon, St. Paul, in his compariſon of the rock Horeb with the Euchariſt, which is truly the body of Jeſus Chriſt, ſaid, *the rock was Jeſus Chriſt*. After propoſing the miracle of the cloud, and the paſſage of the Red Sea, he repreſents them as a baptiſm, in order that they might appear more clearly as a figure of the firſt among our ſacraments. In the ſame manner, after propoſing the miracles of the manna and the rock, he ſubjoins a term beſt adapted to make

them repreſentative of the holy Euchariſt, which is Jeſus Chriſt himſelf. *And the rock*, ſays he, *was Jeſus Chriſt.*

Q. May we not explain theſe words: *This is my body*, by thoſe, which Moſes mentions in the inſtitution of the Paſſover: *You ſhall eat the fleſh of the Lamb in haſte; for it is the paſſage of the Lord?* * In this paſſage, the Lamb is called the paſſage of the Lord, becauſe it was the ſign of it.

A. Though this remark were true, yet Proteſtants could not draw from it any concluſion in favor of the explanation they give to the words of the inſtitution. There is a wide difference betwixt giving a ſubſtance the name of an action, and giving one ſubſtance the name of another. In the firſt caſe, the two terms of the propoſition, one of which conveys the idea of a ſubſtance, the other of an action, are of a very different kind. A change in them is manifeſtly impoſſible, nor can ſuch a thought enter any one's mind. But there is not a ſimilar impoſſibility in the change of two ſubſtances. We have many examples, ſuch as that of water being changed into wine, at the marriage in Cana. This ſame anſwer may be applied to the objection they draw, from our Lord's ſaying the chalice is the New Teſtament.

Q. Continue to refute the objection drawn from the words of God concerning the paſſover: *For it is the paſſage of the Lord.*

A. I repeat again, that this paſſage does not furniſh an example, in which a ſign is called by the name of the thing ſignified, when the perſons ſpoken to, had not been prepared to look on it as a ſign. And yet Proteſtants ſhould produce one of this kind, to ſhew it was even poſſible that our Lord, intending to inſtitute a mere ſign of his body, ſhould have taken bread, and without any intimation of a deſign like this, as well as without any

* Exod. xii. 11.

preceding diſcourſe, ſhould have ſaid abruptly to his Apoſtles: *Take, eat, this is my body.* There is nothing ſimilar to it in theſe words: *It is the paſſage of the Lord,* even if they did ſignify, that the Paſchal Lamb was a ſign of the Lord's paſſage; becauſe, in all the verſes that go before this paſſage, God clearly ſhews Moſes, that this Lamb, which he commanded to be taken, was a myſterious object and repreſentative of ſome other thing.

Q. What preparations are there in theſe verſes, that could diſpoſe the Iſraelites to conſider the Lamb as a ſign?

A. God there commands them, to take a lamb without blemiſh, a male, and of one year, to keep it four days, to ſacrifice it preciſely in the evening of the fourth day, to put ſome of the blood on the upper door-poſts of the houſes, to eat it only roaſted at the fire, to conſume the whole, without excepting the feet and entrails, to let no part of it remain until the morning, to eat it with bitter herbs, and in the habit of travellers. Hence the Iſraelites were thoroughly prepared to look on this as a myſterious lamb. But the Apoſtles were not prepared by any diſcourſe of Jeſus Chriſt, to look on the bread, he held in his hands, as bread intended for a ſign. So that we cannot compare theſe words: *This is my body,* with theſe, *This is the paſſage of the Lord,* though we were even certain, that theſe latter ſignified, that the Lamb was a ſign of the paſſage of God.

Q. Why do you intimate, that it is not certain theſe words ſignify, that the Lamb was a ſign of the paſſage?

A. On taking a near view of this text, it appears there is no figure in it, that we muſt take the words, *is,* and, *paſſage,* in their moſt obvious meaning, and that the Lamb is not there called *the paſſage.* We will quote the verſe at length: *Thus you ſhall eat it; you ſhall gird your reins, and you ſhall have ſhoes on your feet, holding ſtaves in your hands, and you ſhall eat in haſte: for it is the paſſage of the Lord.* The clear import of theſe words is, *For then the Lord will paſs,* which is the reaſon of the

commands contained in the preceding verſe, that is, of the immolation of the Lamb on the fourth day, of ſprinkling the upper door-poſts of the houſes, and of eating it in haſte. God himſelf explains in this manner the words, *for it is the paſſage of the Lord*, by adding immediately after, *and I will paſs through the land of Egypt that night, and will kill every firſt-born.* Theſe words then, *for it is the paſſage of the Lord*, are not to be applied to the Lamb, but to the time, in which it was to be eaten, as when we ſay, eat meat, for it is Sunday. When the Lamb is ſpoken of, the Holy Ghoſt does not call it the paſſage, but the victim of the paſſage: for he commands the Iſraelites, when their children, on the feaſt of the paſſover, ſhould aſk the meaning of the Lamb, to anſwer them, by ſaying: *It is the victim of the paſſage of the Lord, when he paſſed over the houſes of the children of Iſrael in Egypt, ſtriking the Egyptians, and ſaving our houſes.* Thus, if this text, *For it is the paſſage of the Lord*, be accurately examined, we may ſay, there is not even any figure at all in theſe words, which Proteſtants are perpetually citing, in confirmation of the figurative ſenſe they apply to the words of the inſtitution; words which, nevertheleſs, were the firſt proof the Reformers made uſe of, who broached the figurative ſenſe, and which they pretend to have learned by a ſpecies of revelation.*

Q. Having thus explained the moſt common objections, which Proteſtants draw from the Holy Scripture, concerning the words of the inſtitution, pleaſe to clear up that, which they deduce from ſome words of St. Paul on the Euchariſt. If St. Paul, ſay they, had believed the real preſence of Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt, he would not have taught, that the Lord cometh not till the end of the world, which he does, nevertheleſs, by exhorting the Church to ſhew the death of the Lord in the holy communion, *until he come.* †

---

* Zuinglius. † 1 Cor. xi. 26.

A. By this coming, we muſt not underſtand every manner, in which our Lord's body may be preſent on earth, nor even every manner of viſible preſence; otherwiſe the celebration of the Euchariſt ſhould have ceaſed, when our Lord came to comfort S. Paul in the caſtle at Jeruſalem. *The night following*, ſays St. Luke, *the Lord ſtood by him, and ſaid: be conſtant.** The Apoſtle, therefore, only ſpoke to the Corinthians of his viſible coming in glory at the end of the world, to judge all men. No proof can be drawn from this paſſage, that Jeſus Chriſt may not ſometimes appear to his ſervants before the end of the world, nor that he may not be inviſibly preſent in the Euchariſt. The Holy Scripture only affirms, that our Lord will come to judge the living and the dead; but it never teaches, as the Proteſtants perpetually repreſent, that he will never come but to judge the living and the dead.

CHAP. VII.

In which thoſe difficulties are removed, which are raiſed from paſſages of the Holy Scripture, that have no relation to the Euchariſt.

Q. BESIDES the objections made from parts of the Holy Scripture, that treat of the Euchariſt, there are others, which Proteſtants draw from other paſſages.

A. We ſhould not look for the doctrine of the Holy Ghoſt on the Euchariſt, in thoſe paſſages, in which the ſacred writers never thought of the Euchariſt. When I undertook to aſcertain the doctrine of the real preſence, from the Holy Scripture, I only had recourſe to thoſe paſſages, in which the Holy Ghoſt meant to ſpeak of this auguſt ſacrament.

* Acts xxiii. 11.

Q. Beſides this general reflection, what do you ſay in particular to ſo many paſſages, that repreſent the body of Jeſus Chriſt to be in heaven ſince his aſcenſion?

A. All Catholics believe this truth.

Q. But if our Lord's body is in heaven, it cannot be on the earth, for a body cannot be in different places at the ſame time.

A. Such words are the dictates of weak reaſon, and are not found in any part of the word of God. The Holy Scripture informs us, that our Lord's body is in heaven; it likewiſe ſays, that his ſacred body is in the Euchariſt, for which reaſon, we believe both theſe things. As it would be contrary to the word of God, to ſay the body of Jeſus Chriſt is not in heaven, becauſe it affirms it to be in the Euchariſt; ſo it would be, to infer it is not in the Euchariſt, becauſe it ſays it is in heaven.

Q. Is there any example in the Holy Scripture on this ſubject?

A. There is. For as we believe the eſſence of God to be entire in heaven and on earth, becauſe the Holy Scripture aſſerts both, though we do not comprehend how a ſpirit can be entire in an infinity of places at the ſame time; ſo in like manner we believe, that the body of Jeſus Chriſt is in heaven and in the Euchariſt, induced to it by the authority of the Holy Scripture, though we do not comprehend the manner of its exiſtence in ſeveral places at the ſame time.

Q. Do you find any thing elſe in the Holy Scripture, that has any relation to this objection?

A. I will add, that Proteſtants, who conſtantly aſſert, that our Lord's body was not to quit heaven after his aſcenſion, till his laſt coming, and who read in the hiſtory of St. Paul, that our Lord appeared to him, and ſpoke to him in the caſtle of Jeruſalem, * ſhould there find ſome reaſon for entertaining a doubt, whether our

* Acts xxiii. 11.

Lord's body cannot be in ſeveral places at the ſame time, and this even in a viſible ſtate.

Q. The Holy Scripture does not only ſay, that the body of Jeſus Chriſt is in heaven, but likewiſe expreſsly teaches its abſence from the earth; as, for example, when our Lord ſays to his Diſciples: *The poor you have always with you, but me you have not always.*

A. Theſe paſſages import, that Jeſus Chriſt is no longer preſent on earth in that viſible manner, in which he was ſubject to the infirmities of this life, converſed with men, and was relieved by them in his bodily neceſſities; for example, by the anointing of his feet. So after the angel had vaniſhed out of the ſight of Gideon,* and that of Sampſon's parents,† they might have ſaid the angel was no longer with them, without denying the poſſibility of his being preſent in an inviſible manner.

Q. Are you taught by the Holy Scripture, that our Lord might have ſaid, that he would be no longer with them, meaning only that he would be no longer with them in the ſame ſtate?

A. Nothing occurs more frequently, than paſſages, in which it ſays, God is no more in certain places, becauſe he is no more there in the manner, in which he had before ſhewn himſelf, either there or in other places.‡ Our Lord, ſpeaking of his humanity, expreſſes himſelf in this ſame manner. For though he appeared to the Apoſtles after his reſurrection, and was ſeen by them, yet becauſe he was not then in a ſtate of weakneſs and mortality, as before his death, he ſpeaks to them as if he had been no longer with them. *Theſe are the words*, ſays he to them, *which I ſpoke to you while I was yet with you.* § And in other parts Jeſus Chriſt repreſents himſelf as if he were not in the world, becauſe his preſence

---

* Judg. vi. 21, 23. † Judg. xiii. 21.
‡ Gen. iv. 14, 16. xviii. 33. Exod. iii. 8. xiv. 20. Jon. i. 3, 4. 1 Kings xix. 11, 12.
§ Luke xxiv. 44.

was tranſient, and would be of ſhort duration. *I told you not theſe things from the beginning, becauſe I was with you.* * *I am no more in the world; while I was with them, I kept them in thy name.* † The letter therefore ſhould not be too cloſely adhered to in thoſe paſſages, in which Jeſus Chriſt ſpeaks of times poſterior to his aſcenſion as if he would then be abſent, nor ſhould any one maintain, that ſuch paſſages preclude every kind of preſence of his body.

Q. The Holy Scripture does not only teach, that the body of Jeſus Chriſt is no longer on the earth, but moreover our Lord ſeems to have taken precautions to prevent our belief of its preſence in the Euchariſt. This is deduced from the paſſage, which warns Chriſtians from believing ſuch as ſhould ſay: *Lo here is Chriſt, or Chriſt is there.* ‡

A. On a peruſal of the chapter, from which this paſſage is taken, one clearly perceives there is nothing in it concerning the Euchariſt, and that it is only to be underſtood of ſome pretended Meſſiahs, who would come and ſay: *I am the Chriſt.* Our Lord judged expedient to fortify the faithful againſt theſe impoſters, becauſe he foreſaw ſeveral would riſe up from time to time, in different ages of the church, and that, in particular, many would ſtart up at the time of the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, which was then at hand.

Q. How do you prove this explanation?

A. By the part preceding the paſſage, by the part following it, and by the paſſage itſelf conſidered at length.

Q. Prove your explanation by what precedes the paſſage.

A. The occaſion of our Lord's diſcourſe, according to the relation of the Evangeliſts, was this; being on Mount Olivet, from which there was a view of the temple, and his Diſciples endeavouring to excite in him an admiration of the beauty of the edifice, he foretold to them its ruin; and when they queſtioned him concerning the time of a deſtruction ſo aſtoniſhing to them,

* John xvi. 5. † John xvii. 11, 12. ‡ Mat. xxiv. 23.

our Lord anſwered them, that it would be preceded by many great events, and among others that many ſeducers would ſtart up, calling themſelves the Meſſiah, ſent by God to deliver the Jews from their miſeries. It is evident, that as he was there ſpeaking of events, that would happen before the deſtruction of the temple, it was foreign to his purpoſe to ſay any thing relating to the Euchariſt; but quite agreeable to it, that he ſhould ſpeak of theſe impoſtors, many of whom actually appeared before that deſtruction.

Q. Prove your opinion, by what follows this prediction of our Lord, concerning thoſe who ſhould ſay: *Chriſt is here, or Chriſt is there.*

A. Our Lord adds, in the ſubſequent part of the diſcourſe: *Amen I ſay to you, this generation ſhall not paſs, till all theſe things be done.* Therefore our Lord ſpeaks of an event, of which many then living would be witneſſes. So that this explication is far diſtant from that of thoſe, who apply theſe words: *They will ſay to you, lo Chriſt is here, or there,* to ſomething they pretend to have happened in the latter ages of the Church. For the article of the real preſence, to which they apply this text, appears to them to have been a production of the ninth age. But every one knows, that of the many impoſtors, who have aſſumed the character of the Meſſiah, ſeveral roſe up juſt before the deſtruction of Jeruſalem. As that was the time pointed out by the Prophets for the coming of the Meſſiah, as the greater part of the Jews expected this Meſſiah to be a temporal King, and as their great calamities made them redouble their wiſhes for his coming, many ambitious ſeducers took the advantage of theſe circumſtances, and aſſembled troops, to raiſe themſelves to the ſovereignty, by pretending to be the Meſſiah ſo eagerly expected.

Q. Prove now your explication, by a diſcuſſion of the whole paſſage, in which Jeſus Chriſt gives a caution againſt believing thoſe, who ſhould ſay: *Chriſt is here, or Chriſt is there.*

A. Our Lord there expreſsly declares, that the reaſon for this warning was, *becauſe there will riſe up falſe Chriſts,* * *and many will come in my name, ſaying, I am Chriſt.* † This was verified in theſe ſeducers; they gave themſelves out for the true Meſſiah.

Q. Had theſe ſeducers no other characteriſtics, by which it might be known, that this paſſage was to be underſtood of them?

A. A dread of being put to death by the Romans for ſedition, made them at firſt hide themſelves in houſes, or in the deſerts of Judea, which were full of caverns, as we ſee in the hiſtory of Joſuah and David. From theſe retreats, where theſe impoſtors concealed themſelves, till they durſt appear in public, and be enabled to reſiſt the Roman power, they ſent out emiſſaries on all ſides, to proclaim the Meſſiah was come. *Lo he is here, or he is there,* ſaid they. *Behold he is in the deſert.* He is in a hidden place, he waits for you to join his ſtandard againſt the Romans. There were ſeveral falſe Prophets among theſe emiſſaries, who pretended to work miracles in ſupport of their fictions. Many thouſands of the Jews were deceived by theſe impoſtors, and with them fell by the ſwords of the Roman armies. For the divine vengeance, ſpreading itſelf from eaſt to weſt, left no part of the Jewiſh nation unpuniſhed; and the Roman eagles overtook them in all their retreats. Thus all the circumſtances of this prediction of Jeſus Chriſt, were verified by theſe Meſſiahs.

Q. Have you any thing more to add on this ſubject?

A. I will only add, that as it is evident, that the Proteſtant explication of this paſſage, cannot be reconciled, either with the cauſe of the prediction, or the time of its accompliſhment, ſo it is equally clear, that it is inconſiſtent with the paſſage itſelf. If Jeſus Chriſt had intended to have ſpoken of the holy Euchariſt in theſe words: *If they ſay to you, Chriſt is here, or there, believe*

* Mark xiii. 21, 22. † Mat. xxiv. 5.

it not, it would have been foreign to his purpoſe, to have aſſigned as a reaſon for this advice: *For many falſe Meſſiahs will riſe up, many will come in my name, ſaying, I am Chriſt*; for this has not the moſt diſtant reference to the Euchariſt. It would in like manner, have been equally foreign to have added, *If then they ſay to you, Chriſt is in the deſert, go ye not out*; for we do not retire to hidden parts of the deſert, to celebrate the Euchariſt. This whole paſſage is ſo diſſonant to the notion our adverſaries are deſirous of affixing to it, that ſeveral of them, in order to make it in ſome manner plauſible, have ſuppoſed, without any grounds, that in the original, the words were, *If they ſay to you, Chriſt is in the Ciborium*, which neither can be reconciled to the text, nor to the ſubſequent part of the diſcourſe of Jeſus Chriſt.

Q. Draw your concluſion from all you have ſaid.

A. I affirm it then to be moſt manifeſt, that this paſſage is not to be underſtood of the holy Euchariſt, as Proteſtants aſſert, but that it is to be explained, as Catholics ſay, of thoſe falſe Meſſiahs, who ſtart up from time to time, and particularly of thoſe, who appeared at the time of the deſtruction of the Jews. This is a ſtriking example of the manner, in which our opponents diſtort the Holy Scripture, as they inceſſantly recur to this paſſage, to prove their opinion concerning the holy Euchariſt, though it evidently has not the leaſt reference to it.

Q. There is another paſſage among the diſcourſes of Jeſus Chriſt, which they frequently wreſt to this ſubject. I mean that, in which our Lord ſays: *Whatſoever entereth into the mouth, goeth into the belly, and is caſt out into the privy.* * Does this paſſage prove, that our Lord's body does not enter into the mouth?

A. Our Lord, in that place, ſpeaks only of ordinary meats, his words have not the leaſt reference to the holy Euchariſt.

---

* Mat. xv. 17.

Q. Can exceptions be thus admitted from general propoſitions, that occur in the Holy Scripture?

A. We have numberleſs examples of it, and without even going any farther than the preſent paſſage, one preſents itſelf. Our Lord ſays there, in general terms: *Not that which goeth into the mouth, defileth a man.* Yet it is certain, that an exceſs of meat and wine, which enters into the mouth, defiles the ſoul.

Q. Does the Holy Scripture ſhew, that we muſt not explain, according to the letter, and particularly in regard of the Euchariſt, the univerſality of this propoſition: *Whatſoever entereth into the mouth, defileth not a man, but goeth into the belly, and is caſt out into the privy.*

A. Yes. For as to the firſt part of this paſſage, St. Paul teaches us, that the Euchariſt received unworthily, defiles a man, and expoſes him to damnation. And as to the ſecond part, it is certain that our Lord, after his reſurrection, was not ſubject to the weakneſſes of nature ſpoken of in this verſe. Yet it is not leſs certain that he ſometimes ate during that time.* *We ate and drank with him*, ſays St. Peter, *after he was raiſed from the dead.*† Laſtly, it is not true to ſay, in a ſtrict ſenſe, *that all that entereth into the mouth, is caſt into the privy:* for then we ſhould receive no nouriſhment from our food. Thus Jeſus Chriſt makes it ſufficiently clear, that this paſſage is not to be taken according to the letter, but in a more elevated ſenſe.

Q. Beſides the objections deduced from the diſcourſes of Jeſus Chriſt, Proteſtants likewiſe draw ſome from the writings of the Apoſtles. St. Paul, ſay they, aſſures us, that *God dwelleth not in temples made with hands.*‡ But if our Lord were really preſent in the Holy Euchariſt, which is reſerved in Churches, it would follow, contrary to the words of the Apoſtle, that God dwelleth in temples made by the hands of men.

---

* Luke xxiv. 43. † Acts x. 41. ‡ Acts xvii. 24.

A. The Apoſtle's meaning is, that God is not like the Pagan Gods, which were ſo ſhut up in temples as not to be preſent in any other place. This paſſage then is not oppoſed to Catholics; for they do not ſay that our Lord's divinity is confined in Churches.

Q. Can you prove the ſolidity of this anſwer from the Holy Scripture itſelf?

A. We ſee there, that our Lord was ſeveral times in the temple of Jeruſalem. Thus it appears from the Holy Scripture, that the preſence of our Lord's body in a temple is not contrary to the truth propoſed by St. Paul to the Athenians, viz. that the divinity does not dwell in temples built by man.

Q. The ſame Apoſtle informs us, that our Lord was made like us. * But if his body were in the Euchariſt, in the ſtate believed by the Catholic Church, it would not be like ours.

A. St. Paul in this place ſpeaks of our Lord relatively to that infirm ſtate, in which he appeared on earth; but he never meant to deny that his ſacred body could be in a ſtate different from ours. In reality, our Lord's body after the reſurrection was not like ours in every thing; *for he entered the chamber*, where the Apoſtles were, *when the doors were ſhut*. And in his life time he walked upon the waters, and made himſelf inviſible. Such things are not common to our bodies with that of Jeſus Chriſt. †

Q. Having explained the principal paſſages, which Proteſtants object on this ſubject, tell me whether the Holy Scripture ſupplies us with any anſwer to the objection, which they draw from the incomprehenſibility of the real preſence of the body of Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt?

A. It teaches, that the incomprehenſibility of an article

---

* Rom. viii. 3. Phil. ii. 7.

† John xx. 19. Mat. xiv. 26. Mark vi. 49. Luke iv. 30.

is no reaſon for the rejecting of it, when it ſays, *we muſt captivate our underſtandings to the obedience of Chriſt.* * It evidently teaches this truth, when it propoſes the articles of the Trinity, the Incarnation and the Reſurrection, myſteries totally incomprehenſible.

Q. Pleaſe to ſay ſomething more on this objection.

A. I add that it is injurious to the Chriſtian Religion, to ſet aſide any of its articles on account of their incomprehenſibility. In reality they all tend to give an irreſiſtible force to the argument drawn from the propagation of Chriſtianity in proof of its divine origin. A religion, which is compoſed of doctrines ſo little conformable to human reaſon, could never have been received in the world, unleſs God had been the author of it. On this account, to cut off from Chriſtianity one of theſe incomprehenſible myſteries, is to cut off one of the marks of its divine origin. Moreover theſe incomprehenſible myſteries reciprocally ſupport one another. The real preſence ſupports the Incarnation and Trinity, as the Incarnation and Trinity ſupport the real preſence. It is incomprehenſible that Jeſus born of a woman, ſhould be God from all eternity; but it being certain he is God, faith finds no difficulty in believing he could give that body to be eaten, which he had appropriated to himſelf, by placing it for this purpoſe in a ſtate incomprehenſible to our reaſon. It is in like manner incomprehenſible that our Lord could thus give his body to be eaten; but it being proved he hath given it, faith readily aſſents to his Godhead. He who can thus make himſelf one with us, muſt neceſſarily be one with the heavenly father. † He who can quicken us with this food, neceſſarily hath him for father, who lives for ever. ‡ The myſtery of the real preſence, and the reſurrection, likewiſe ſtrengthen each other. For it is evident, that he who hath power

---

* 2 Cor. x. 5. † John xvii. 21. ‡ John vi. 58.

to raiſe again the bodies of all men, hath likewiſe power to put his own into an incomprehenſible ſtate. And it is likewiſe manifeſt, that he who can thus give us his body, can likewiſe raiſe ours to life again. *He that eateth my fleſh*, ſays he, *I will raiſe him up at the laſt day.** Thus it follows, that to retrench the real preſence from chriſtianity, is to throw aſide a ſupport of other myſteries, and to weaken the argument, which the propagation of the chriſtian religion affords of its divine origin.

Q. Which of all the incomprehenſible articles is the leaſt expoſed to attack on account of its incomprehenſibility?

A. That of the real preſence. As to the other articles there is not any paſſage, in which the Holy Ghoſt hath expreſsly pronounced them incomprehenſible; but he hath plainly pointed out the incomprehenſibility of this eating of our Lord's fleſh. For we read in St. John, that the Jews and even the Diſciples having heard him ſpeak of this eating, ſaid: *How can this man give us his fleſh to eat? This ſaying is hard, and who can hear it?* † St. John likewiſe adds, that on account of this myſtery many of our Lord's Diſciples left him, ſo incomprehenſible was it to them. But I will not preſs this reflection farther, having noticed it, in my obſervations on the ſixth chapter of St. John.

Q. From what ſource do all the objections of Proteſtants on this ſubject flow?

A. We may here apply to them, what our Lord ſaid of thoſe, who denied the Reſurrection, that they know not the power of God, nor the Scriptures; ‡ they know not the power of God, for that power obliges us to believe, that he could give us his body, in the Euchariſt; and they know not the Scripture, for the Scripture teaches, that he moſt certainly did give it.

---

* John vi. 55. † Ibid. 53, 61. ‡ Mat. xxii. 29.

CHAP. VIII.

Of Tranſubſtantiation.

Q. DO you believe there is bread in the Holy Euchariſt after the conſecration?

A. No. For when Jeſus Chriſt promiſed to give the Euchariſt, he ſaid: *The bread that I will give is my fleſh*, * and when he inſtituted it, he did not ſay: *in this bread is my body*; but he ſaid, *This is my body*. † Theſe words, *This is my body*, might, it is true, ſignify, *in this bread is my body*, if it was uſual for bread to contain the body of Jeſus Chriſt: as theſe words, *This is wine*, clearly import, in the uſual acceptation, *there is wine in this veſſel*, becauſe the veſſel is commonly uſed to contain wine; otherwiſe, theſe words, *This is ſuch a thing*, are generally to be underſtood in a literal ſenſe, to denote the ſubſtance of the thing ſpoken of. The bread, which Jeſus Chriſt held in his hands, not having been made for the purpoſe of containing his body, theſe words, *This is my body*, cannot mean, this bread contains my body. They then ſignify, that the thing, which Jeſus Chriſt held in his hands, was really his body.

Q. Our Lord, ſays: *I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I ſhall drink it new with you in the kingdom of my father*. ‡ Do not theſe words prove there is wine in the Euchariſt?

A. No. For it is far from being certain, that Jeſus Chriſt ſpoke them after the inſtitution of the Euchariſt.

Q. If Jeſus Chriſt had pronounced them after the conſecration, would they prove there was real wine in the Holy Chalice?

A. No. For it may be, that after what was in the Holy Chalice was conſumed, our Lord might have

---

* John vi. 52. † Matt. xxvi. 26. ‡ Matt. xxvi. 29.

ſpoken theſe words of wine in general, or of ſome other veſſel of wine, that remained on the table; that by this expreſſion he might forewarn his Diſciples of his approaching death, which, till then, they had not believed. Beſides, allowing that Jeſus Chriſt did ſpeak theſe words with reference to the Euchariſtic cup, we ought to believe, that theſe words, *of the fruit of the vine*, ſhould be taken in a figurative ſenſe of the blood of Jeſus Chriſt, who is the true vine; as they are to be underſtood in a figurative ſenſe in the latter part of the ſame verſe, where they are introduced to expreſs the joys of heaven: *I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I ſhall drink it new in the kingdom of my father.*

Q. What appears to you moſt probable concerning theſe words of our Lord: *I will not drink of this fruit of the vine?*

A. It ſeems moſt probable, that our Lord ſpoke them before, and not after the conſecration.

Q. Is it not a mark of diſreſpect for the Holy Scripture, to maintain, that words, which St. Matthew and St. Mark relate after the conſecration, were pronounced before it?

A. It is manifeſt, from many examples, that the ſacred writers did not always place the words and actions they deſcribe in the order they happened. For example, in the ſeventh chapter of Geneſis, the entrance of the children of Noah into the ark is recited after the forty days rain; * and in the twenty-fourth chapter of Geneſis, Moſes ſays in the twenty-third verſe, that Abraham's ſervant took out the ear-rings and bracelets for Rebecca, before he aſked who ſhe was; and in the forty-ſeventh verſe it is ſaid he firſt aſked who ſhe was, and then he gave the preſents.

Q. Why do you think theſe words, *I will not drink of*

* Gen: vii. 13.

the fruit of the vine, were ſpoken by our Lord before the celebration of the holy Euchariſt?

A. St. Luke relates them before it,* and it appears, that the recital of this Evangeliſt ought to be preferred with regard to the order of what happened in the inſtitution of the Holy Euchariſt, to the recital of St. Matthew; and of courſe to that of St. Mark, who generally ſeems to have copied after St. Matthew, and to have followed him ſtep by ſtep.

Q. Why do you give the preference to St. Luke's recital in regard of the order?

A. Not only becauſe he declares in the beginning of his Goſpel, that he will relate things in order;† but particularly becauſe it is clear he intended more than the other Evangeliſts, to relate the inſtitution of the Holy Euchariſt, with its circumſtances in regular order.

Q. Give ſome proof of this.

A. So little did St. Mark deſign to relate every thing in order, which paſſed at the inſtitution of the Holy Euchariſt, that he mentions the Apoſtles' participation of the ſacred Chalice, before the benediction of it by our Lord. *Having taken the Chalice*, ſays he, *giving thanks he gave it to them: and they all drank of it, and he ſaid to them: This is my blood of the New Teſtament, which ſhall be ſhed for many.*‡

Q. Have you any other reaſon for preferring St. Luke before the other Evangeliſts, in regard to what was ſaid and done at the inſtitution of the Euchariſt?

A. The ſilence of St. Matthew and St. Mark, concerning the ſupper preſcribed by the law, ſhews plainly that they did not intend to give an exact and minute deſcription of all that paſſed at this laſt repaſt of our Lord. St. Luke, on the contrary, gives an accurate deſcription of it, and relates every thing, that was done in the legal ſupper, what Jeſus Chriſt ſays of the Lamb, what he

* Luke xxii. 17. † Luke i. 3. ‡ Mark xiv. 23, 24.

ſays of the Paſchal Chalice, and goes on to the benediction of the Euchariſtic Bread, and of the Chalice. Now, in this recital, in which the Holy Ghoſt hath pleaſed to obſerve the moſt exact order, it is related, that it was before, and not after the conſecration of the ſymbols, that Jeſus Chriſt ſaid, *I will not drink of the fruit of the vine till I drink it new in the kingdom of heaven.* *

Q. Have you any thing more to ſay on this head?

A. St. Matthew and St. Mark, in their relation of theſe words, *I will not drink of this fruit of the vine*, do not point out by any particular word, that they give them in the order, in which they were ſpoken by our Lord. So that, without any want of reverence for their authority, one may be allowed to ſay they were not pronounced in the ſame order they are related. We cannot ſay the ſame of St. Luke; he tells us expreſsly that the Euchariſt was inſtituted after he had ſpoken thoſe words to his diſciples. This is the paſſage: *Having taken the chalice, he gave thanks, and ſaid: Take and divide it among you. For I ſay to you, that I will not drink of the fruit of the vine till the kingdom of God come. And*, or, as moſt interpreters, of both communions, have it, *afterwards taking bread he gave thanks, and brake, and gave to them ſaying: This is my body.* † By this narration, St. Luke plainly declares, that the Euchariſt was inſtituted after our Lord had ſaid to his diſciples: *I will not drink of the fruit of the vine.* Hence it appears, that we cannot affirm, without an injury to St. Luke's veracity, that theſe words were not ſpoken by our Lord, till after the inſtitution of the Holy Euchariſt.

Q. Why have St. Matthew and St. Mark related theſe words: *I will not drink of this fruit of the vine*, after the inſtitution of the Euchariſt, if they were ſpoken before?

A. The reaſon is becauſe the Evangeliſts frequently

---

* Luke xxii. 18. † Ibid. 19.

introduced the diſcourſes and actions of Jeſus Chriſt, on occaſion of ſome other diſcourſe or action occurring, which bore ſome relation to them, eſpecially when the connection of their hiſtory did not allow them to inſert them in the time and order, in which they fell out. As St. Luke deſcribed the legal ſupper, an opportunity preſented itſelf of relating, in their proper place, the words, which the chalice of the legal ſupper gave occaſion to our Lord to addreſs to his diſciples: *I will not drink, &c.* On the contrary, St. Matthew and St. Mark, who have not mentioned this legal chalice, not having an opportunity of placing theſe words of ſo great import in their proper order, took an opportunity from the Euchariſtic cup, of relating them, to ſhew how our Lord declared to his Apoſtles, that at length the hour was come, in which he was to ſuffer that death they had hitherto refuſed to believe, notwithſtanding he had ſo repeatedly foretold it in the cleareſt terms.

Q. What do you infer from hence, namely, that it was before the inſtitution of the Holy Euchariſt, that Jeſus Chriſt ſaid: *I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine?*

A. I gather from hence that theſe words are not admiſſible as a proof that there is wine in the conſecrated chalice; they rather ſhew there is none. For if Jeſus Chriſt had drunk real wine in the Holy Euchariſt, as Proteſtants hold, this would be contrary to what he had juſt ſaid at the ſupper of the legal paſſover, *that he would not drink of the fruit of the vine.*

Q. If the bread was changed into the body of Jeſus Chriſt by the conſecration, St. Paul would not give the appellation of bread to the conſecrated Euchariſt, as we ſee in the epiſtle to the Corinthians? *

A. St. Paul does not only call it bread, but *this bread*, to diſtinguiſh it from the material bread. By this word,

* 1 Cor. xi. 26. 27.

he puts the Corinthians in mind, that he ſpoke of that bread, of which (as he had juſt remarked) Jeſus Chriſt had ſaid it was his body; and recalls to their memory all they had learned at other times concerning the Euchariſt. Beſides we ſhould not be ſurprized, that the Holy Apoſtle gives our Lord's body the name of *bread*, ſince in this he follows the example of our Lord, who hath repeatedly given it this appellation. *I am*, ſays he, *the living bread, which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he ſhall live for ever: and the bread that I will give, is my fleſh for the life of the world.*

Q. Why did our Lord give to his body the appellation of *bread?*

A. The appellation of *bread*, is uſed in the Holy Scripture to ſignify, in general, any thing that nouriſhes. Thus manna is called *the bread of heaven*, or *the bread of Angels*, becauſe made by Angels above the earth, and ſent down by them to feed the Iſraelites. The body of Jeſus Chriſt is then very properly called *bread*, ſince it is the nouriſhment of our ſouls.

Q. Are there any other reaſons, that could make St Paul give the name of *bread* to the body of Jeſus Chriſt?

A. Yes; for beſides its property of nouriſhing our ſouls, by the words of conſecration, bread is changed into the body of Jeſus Chriſt, and after this change ſtill retains the appearances of bread.

Q. Can our Lord's body be called bread, becauſe bread by conſecration is changed into his body in the Holy Euchariſt?

A. The Holy Scripture thus calls things by their former names, even after they are changed. In the Old Teſtament Eve is called the *bone* of Adam, * and the rods, after their change into ſerpents, are called *rods*: † and in the New, the wine at the marriage in Cana,

* Gen: ii. 23. † Exod: vii. 12.

bears the name of *water*;* and they who had been blind and deaf, are ſtill called blind and deaf after their cure, *the blind ſee, the deaf hear.*†

Q. Can the body of Jeſus Chriſt, in the Holy Euchariſt, be called *bread*, as you have remarked, becauſe it is there under the appearances of bread?

A. It is likewiſe the manner of the Holy Scripture, to call things by the name of the things they appear to be, though they are not ſuch things in reality. Thus in the Old Teſtament, the Angels that appeared in human form are called men:‡ and the figures of Cherubim, of oxen, and pomegranates, that were in the temple, have the denominations of the things themſelves. Our Lord likewiſe gives the name of ſerpent to the figure of a ſerpent, which Moſes lifted up in the deſert. §

Q. St. Luke, in the Acts of the Apoſtles, and St. Paul, in the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians, ſeveral times call the Euchariſt, *The breaking of bread*, which they would not have done unleſs there had been bread broken. ‖

A. We may anſwer, that in thoſe places, it is not the body of Jeſus Chriſt that is called *bread*, and that this word ſignifies the external part of the Euchariſt, which may be denominated *bread*, becauſe it appears ſuch to all our ſenſes.

Q. May not one likewiſe ſay, that in that place, our Lord's body is conſidered under the idea of bread, as in the eleventh chapter to the Corinthians?

A. Yes. But we muſt add, that to *break bread*, ſignifies in the Holy Scripture, to diſtribute bread, as when Iſaias ſays, the choſen faſt is to *deal bread to the hungry*, (to *break* in the original) that is, to diſtribute it.¶ *The*

---

* John ii. 9. † Mat. xi. 5.
‡ Gen. xvii. 16. Dan. ix. 21. x. 5. xii. 6, 7. Zac. i. 8.
§ John iii. 14. ‖ Acts ii. 42, 46. 1 Cor. x. 16.
¶ Iſai. lviii. 7.

little ones, ſaith Jeremy, *have aſked for bread, and there was none to break it to them*, that is, to diſtribute it.* In the ſame manner, *the breaking of bread* may ſignify the diſtribution of the ſacred bread of the holy Euchariſt; for this heavenly bread, which is our Lord's body, is diſtributed to thoſe who communicate.

Q. Is this all you anſwer to the propoſed difficulty?

A. We may further obſerve, that it is common to attribute to the perſon himſelf things that happen to his clothing. We ſay, for example, we are wet when our garments are ſo; and one may ſay after the ſame manner, that the body of our Lord is broken in the Holy Euchariſt, becauſe the ſpecies are broken, with which he is covered.

Q. Can you make this form of ſpeech more intelligible, by any example of the Holy Scripture?

A. In this manner the Holy Scripture attributes to God, what properly ſpeaking, agreed only to the cloud and the ark, though the preſence of God in the cloud and the ark, is far from being ſimilar to the preſence of Jeſus Chriſt in the Holy Euchariſt. *The Lord went before them to ſhew the way*, ſays the Holy Spirit with reference to the pillar of a cloud.† When the ark advanced in the deſert, Moſes ſaid, *Ariſe, O Lord, and let thy enemies be ſcattered.* And when it ſtopt, he ſaid, *Return, O Lord, to the multitude of the hoſt of Iſrael.*‡ David expreſſes himſelf in the ſame manner, when the ark entered Jeruſalem: *Lift up your gates, and the King of glory ſhall enter in.* § *We will go into his tabernacle,* ‖ ſays he again in other places, ſpeaking of God with reference to the ark, *We will adore in the place where his feet ſtood. Ariſe, O Lord into thy reſting place: thou and the ark which thou haſt ſanctified. O God, when thou didſt go forth in the ſight of thy people; when thou didſt*

---

* Lam. iv. 4. † Exod. xiii. 21. ‡ Num. x. 35, 36.
§ Pſ. xxiii. 7. ‖ Pſ. cxxxi. 7.

paſs through the deſert: * *God is aſcended with the ſound of trumpet.* † All theſe actions, of advancing, ſtopping, aſcending, going in and going out, are attributed to God, though ſtrictly they are only applicable to the ark. It is manifeſt, that, in this ſame ſtyle, we may ſay our Lord's body is broken in the Holy Euchariſt, though this, ſtrictly ſpeaking, agrees only to the ſymbols.

Q. But when you affirm that, what my eyes tell me is bread, is not bread, you attack the certitude of arguments drawn from the teſtimony of the ſenſes, and thus overthrow the foundations of Religion; ſince our Lord has declared our ſenſes competent witneſſes of his miracles: *Relate to John what you have heard and ſeen.* ‡ Our Lord likewiſe appeals to the teſtimony of the ſenſes to evince his Reſurrection: *See my hands and my feet, that it is I myſelf; handle me and ſee; for a ſpirit hath not fleſh and bones, as you ſee me to have.* §

A. Though on certain occaſions we may have been deceived by the teſtimony of the ſenſes, yet we cannot reaſonably conclude from thence, that ſuch teſtimony is uncertain on other occaſions where we have no reaſon to miſtruſt them. Though a tower at a diſtance has appeared to me round when ſquare; or a ſtick in the water crooked though ſtraight; or many objects yellow to my eyes in the jaundice, though not yellow; yet I am not on that account leſs ſure of not being miſtaken, by depending on the teſtimony of the ſenſes, when my eyes are not diſordered, when the objects are at a proportioned diſtance, and when there is no intervening medium to confuſe them. Thus becauſe I ought not to believe my ſenſes when God warns me that the object I look at is not the ſame, that they repreſent, it does not follow from thence, that I ought not to truſt to their teſtimony, when no divine revelation interferes. The Apoſtles then did right in judging by the ſenſes with

* Pſ. lxvii. 8. † Pſ. xlvi. 6. ‡ Matt. xi. 4. § Luke xxiv. 39.

an entire certainty of Jeſus Chriſt's body raiſed from the dead, becauſe there was no divine revelation to cauſe them to miſtruſt their teſtimony in that point. But they were under an obligation of not judging of the Holy Euchariſt by them, becauſe our Lord's inſtructions, on that ſubject, plainly pointed out to them that they were then to form their belief from what they heard, not from what they ſaw. It is very unreaſonable to infer that, becauſe the Apoſtles were not guided by the teſtimony of their ſenſes, when Jeſus Chriſt had commanded them not to believe them, they ought likewiſe to have miſtruſted their teſtimony of the Reſurrection, where he had not even hinted at any cauſe for miſtruſting them, but had even commanded them to believe them, by appealing to their teſtimony.

Q. Mention ſome example in the Holy Scripture on this ſubject.

A. It does not follow, for example, becauſe the Holy Scripture tells us, that the Angels, who appeared to the Patriarchs in the form of men, were not men:* it does not, I ſay, follow from thence, that we are never ſure thoſe we converſe with are men.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Adoration of Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt.

Q. WHAT do you think of the repugnance and vehement oppoſition, which Proteſtants conceive againſt genuflections, and other marks of external reverence, ſhewn to the Euchariſt, either at the altar or in public?

A. They act in direct contradiction to the Holy Scripture. For, though the cloud, that paſſed before Moſes was infinitely inferior in dignity to the Holy

* Gen. xviii. and xix. Heb. xiii. 2.

Euchariſt, Moſes bowed down proſtrate to the earth to adore God in it when it paſſed, and cried out: *O the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, patient, and of much compaſſion and true.* * In like manner, though the ark was a ſymbol infinitely leſs auguſt of God's preſence, than the Holy Euchariſt, yet a veneration of it was enjoined. *Adore*, ſays the royal Prophet, *his foot-ſtool.* † *We will go into his tabernacle, we will adore in the place where his feet ſtood.* ‡ And the faithful then believed they never could give too many external demonſtrations of their piety. So when the ark was carried into the city of David, all the people accompanied it with ſeven choirs of muſic, and David danced with all his might to honor the ark with every demonſtration of joy. It is then expreſsly contrary to the Holy Scripture to diſcommend the external worſhip, which Catholics pay to the Holy Euchariſt, ſince it is an incomparably more auguſt ſymbol of God's preſence among Chriſtians, than the ark was among the Iſraelites.

Q. What principally induces Catholics thus to venerate the Holy Euchariſt?

A. Becauſe it is not only like the ark, an illuſtrious ſymbol of the preſence of God; but becauſe our Lord is there really preſent. So that this worſhip is a real adoration, grounded on all thoſe paſſages of the Holy Scripture, that teach us to adore Jeſus Chriſt, ſuch as the following: *Let all the Angels of God adore him.* ‖ *God hath given him a name above every name: that in the name of Jeſus every knee ſhould bow.* ¶ The adoration of Jeſus Chriſt is inculcated in many other paſſages, and by examples mentioned in the Holy Scripture.

Q. Theſe proofs relate to the adoration of Jeſus Chriſt in general; but we do not find there any command of adoring Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt in particular; this

---

* Exod. xxxiv. 6. 8. † Pſ. xcviii. 5. ‡ Pſ. cxxxi. 7.
§ 2 Sam. vi. 5, 12, 14. ‖ Heb. i. 6. ¶ Philip ii. 10.

particular precept in regard of the Euchariſt is what Proteſtants require.

A. Such a command is not neceſſary: it is ſufficient, if the Holy Scripture has pointed out our duty in general towards an object; we are bound to comply with that duty in all places and times, where and when that object preſents itſelf, though the places and times be not particularized in the Holy Scripture. Thus the general precept of charity towards the poor, makes this charity obligatory in the places where the poor are, though the places be not marked out in particular. In the ſame manner the general precept of adoring Jeſus Chriſt includes that of adoring him wherever he is preſent.

Q. Does it appear in the Holy Scripture, that we are bound, as you ſay, to adore our Lord even in thoſe places, where God has not given any command of adoring him in particular?

A. The Magi adored our Lord in the manger, and the Apoſtles adored him on mount Olivet, without any particular command of adoring him either on the mountain, or in the manger. Likewiſe there is no particular command to adore Jeſus Chriſt in heaven, where all the faithful adore him. Thus, though there be not any particular command to adore Jeſus Chriſt in the Holy Euchariſt, it is ſufficient that faith teaches us he is certainly there preſent, to feel the obligation of adoring him preſs upon us.

Q. Our Lord was viſible in the manger, and on mount Olivet. So that theſe examples cannot be adduced in favor of the Euchariſt, where Jeſus Chriſt's preſence is inviſible.

A. Theſe examples prove we may adore Jeſus Chriſt in a particular place, without a command to adore him in that particular place. Beſides it is not the viſibility of our Lord's body that commands our adoration, but the divinity of his Perſon. So that whether he be ſeen or not ſeen by the faithful, he ought to be the object of their adoration, wherever they know he is. They

ought peculiarly to adore him in thoſe places where they know he is in a particular manner. Thus, though we do not ſee Jeſus Chriſt aſcended into heaven, we do not ceaſe to adore him there, as we are aſſured by faith, that he ſhews himſelf there in a moſt glorious manner. We ought then to adore our Lord in the Holy Euchariſt, though we do not ſee him, being convinced by faith that he is there, and that this preſence is a moſt glorious effect of his goodneſs and almighty power.

Q. If our Lord is adorable in the Holy Euchariſt, the Apoſtles would have paid this tribute of adoration to him, which we do not find in the Holy Scriptures they did.

A. We do not find there, that the Apoſtles were baptized. It would be abſurd to conclude from this ſilence, that they were not. All the actions of the Apoſtles, even ſuch as were moſt neceſſary to their ſalvation, are not related in the Goſpel. A plain refutation of this objection, from an example of the adoration itſelf of Jeſus Chriſt, is, that we do not read in the Holy Scripture, that the bleſſed Virgin and St. Joſeph, adored Jeſus Chriſt at his birth. We do not read there, that the Apoſtles ever adored him during the whole courſe of their lives. It would be wretched reaſoning to infer from this ſilence, that neither the bleſſed Virgin, nor St. Joſeph adored him at his birth, nor the Apoſtles at any time. It is not then deducible from the ſilence of the Goſpel, reſpecting the adoration paid by the Apoſtles to Jeſus Chriſt in the Euchariſt, that this adoration was not paid.

Q. The Holy Scripture is ſo far from informing us, that the Apoſtles adored Jeſus Chriſt in the Holy Euchariſt, that it repreſents them during their communion, in a poſture directly oppoſite to this adoration: for it repreſents them lying in the uſual poſture of the Jews at table.

A. The Holy Scripture does not ſay they continued in the ſame ſituation, the whole time, without ever chang-

ing. There is a beautiful manuſcript in the Library of the King of France, above ſix hundred years old, adorned with paintings in miniature, and in that of the laſt ſupper, Jeſus Chriſt is repreſented in a ſtanding poſture, preſenting the chalice of his blood, to the Apoſtles on their knees. Beſides it is not true, that the poſture ſpoken of in the Goſpel, is inconſiſtent with adoration. There is no poſition in which one cannot adore. When Jacob bleſſed Joſeph's ſons, he adored on his bed.* The Jews frequently adored ſtanding. David ſat down before the ark, though he intended ſolemnly to adore God.† The eſſence of adoration conſiſts only in the motions of the mind and heart.

Q. Having confuted the objections of Proteſtants againſt this adoration, tell me whether you think the Apoſtles adored our Lord in the Euchariſt?

A. Since the eſſence of adoration depends, as I have obſerved, on the ſpirit and heart, we cannot doubt but the Apoſtles adored our Lord in the Holy Euchariſt. They believed our Lord was truly preſent in this Euchariſt which they received. They beheld it as the body of their Saviour, and a body animated with his ſpirit, and ſanctified by the union of his divinity; this conſideration excited in them ardent affections of love and gratitude. This is internal adoration, and the eſſential part of adoration; ſo that there is not the leaſt room to doubt but the Apoſtles really adored Jeſus Chriſt in the Holy Euchariſt.

Q. Can you ſhew from the Holy Scripture, that, whatever might have been the poſture of the Apoſtles at that time, it did not hinder them from adoring him in the Holy Euchariſt?

A. It appears moſt evidently from the very recital of the inſtitution of the Holy Euchariſt. For we cannot deny but the Apoſtles then adored our Lord viſibly

---

* Heb. xi. 21. † Chron. xvii. 16.

preſent; this can only be conteſted by the diſbeliever of his Divinity. I ſay then, that the Apoſtles adored him as inviſibly preſent in the myſteries, with the ſame diſpoſition of mind and body, in which they adored him, when they conſidered his viſible preſence. Thus it is difficult to comprehend how Chriſtians, who acknowledge with us, that the Apoſtles then looked on Jeſus Chriſt as the object of their adorations, can object to us, that the poſture of their bodies proves they could not at that moment conſider as an object of adoration Jeſus Chriſt preſent in the Holy Euchariſt.

CHAP. X.

Of the ſacrifice of the Maſs.

Q. DID the Prophets foretel there would be a ſacrifice in the Chriſtian Church?

A. God ſaid, even in their time, by the mouth of Malachias, *I have no pleaſure in you: and I will not receive a gift of your hand: for, from the riſing of the ſun, to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is ſacrifice; and there is offered to my name a clean offering.* * There was then to be under the New Teſtament, a ſacrifice that would be the object of the public ſervice, and as ſuch was to be ſubſtituted to the worſhip exhibited in the Temple; a ſacrifice, in which the offering and victim would not come from the hands of men; a ſacrifice, that would be offered in every place; a ſacrifice, in which would be offered a pure victim. All this is accompliſhed in the Euchariſt, as Catholics believe and teach, but in no other manner. For the victim, which the Church offers to God, namely our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, is an oblation without ſpot, and

* Malach. i. 10, 11.

is offered in all parts of the world. This victim does not come from the hands of men, but is put, by the bounty and almighty power of God, into their hands, to be preſented to his glorious Majeſty. In ſhort, the oblation the Church makes of this victim, is an external public ſacrifice, that employs and excites the devotion of chriſtians in their religious aſſemblies, as that of the Jews was excited in their ſacrifices.

Q. Was this ſacrifice of the Catholic Church foreſhewn by types, as well as by the prophecies of the Old Teſtament?

A. One may ſay, they all were figures of the auguſt ſacrifice of the Chriſtian Church.

Q. Why did God repreſent the ſacrifice of the Chriſtian Church in ſo many different ſacrifices?

A. On account of its perfection. All the perfections of our divine ſacrifice could not have been repreſented in one only of the ancient ſacrifices. For which reaſon, they were prefigured by ſo many different ones.

Q. Explain in what manner all the ſacrifices of the Old Teſtament repreſented ours.

A. There were three ſorts, ſacrifices of holocauſt, Euchariſtic ſacrifices, and propitiatory and impetratory ſacrifices. The ſacrifices of holocauſt, in which the victim was entirely conſumed, to ſhew the ſovereignty of God, repreſented our ſacrifice, in which the Lamb of God is offered whole to him, to impreſs on our minds a more lively idea of his infinity, to whom ſuch a victim is preſented. The Euchariſtic ſacrifices, ordained in order to praiſe God for his favors, repreſented our Euchariſt, which is offered to bleſs God in Jeſus Chriſt and through Jeſus Chriſt, for all graces conferred upon us. Laſtly, the propitiatory and impetratory ſacrifices, which were appointed to obtain pardon of God for our ſins and other neceſſary bleſſings, repreſented our ſacrifice, by which we endeavour to draw down from God all the graces we ſtand in need of.

Q. Was there not among theſe different kinds of

ſacrifice, ſomething common to them all, in which they were repreſentative of the ſacrifice offered on our altars?

A. They were at the ſame time ſacrifices and figures of ſacrifice, viz. of the ſacrifice of the Croſs, on which Jeſus Chriſt was to be immolated. In the ſame manner we have on our altars, a figure of the great ſacrifice of the Croſs, but a figure, which is at the ſame time a real ſacrifice.

Q. Among the ſacrifices of the old law, were there none, that more particularly expreſſed that of the Chriſtian Church?

A. The Euchariſtic ſacrifices in particular, were an admirable figure of it. There the people being reconciled to God, to whom they had offered a ſacrifice of peace, ate the victim that had been offered to him, which for this purpoſe was carried from the altar, that was as it were the table of God, to the private tables of the Iſraelites. Thus God being perfectly appeaſed by the victim preſented to him in our ſacrifice, the faithful Chriſtians enjoy the ineffable advantage of receiving him, and of thus celebrating the moſt holy of all ſacrifices. Among the Euchariſtic ſacrifices, we ought here to take particular notice of that of the Paſſover. It was at the ſame time a Sacrifice and a Sacrament; a Sacrifice, becauſe the Paſchal Lamb was offered to God on his altar; and a Sacrament, becauſe after it was offered it was eaten by the Iſraelites, and was to them a memorial of their deliverance from the ſlavery of Egypt. In the ſame manner the myſtery of our altars is a ſacrifice, becauſe Jeſus Chriſt, our Paſch, is there offered to God on the altar; and a Sacrament, becauſe the faithful receive him there, to nouriſh them in the hope of everlaſting life, and to recal to their minds the redemption purchaſed by the blood of Jeſus Chriſt. In the ſame comparative manner, our Baptiſm, which ſucceeded Circumciſion, is only a Sacrament, as Circumciſion was only a Sacrament; and our Euchariſt is at the ſame

time a ſacrifice and a Sacrament, as the Paſſover, which preceded it, was alſo a Sacrifice and a Sacrament.

Q. Point out ſome other particular ſacrifices of the Old Teſtament, that repreſented ſome property of ours.

A. It was very clearly repreſented by the ſacrifices, in which the victim was immolated before the door of the tabernacle of teſtimony, when its blood having been offered for an expiation in the Sanctuary by the High Prieſt, the body was burnt without the camp.* In a ſimilar manner, the Lamb of God was ſacrificed long ago on Mount Calvary, and is now offered to God on our altars.

Q. Continue your relation of the ancient ſacrifices, that prefigured any perfection of the ſacrifice of our altars.

A. We ſhould be ſingularly attentive to that of the two goats, one of which was ſlain, and the other turned into the deſert; and to that of the two ſparrows, one of which was ſacrificed, and the other permitted to fly away, after it had been ſprinkled with the blood of the firſt.† Our Lord fulfilled the firſt part of theſe figurative ſacrifices on the Croſs, where he ſhed his blood for the perfect expiation of our ſins; and he accompliſhed the ſecond on our altars, where he is offered to God without dying on them; he is there nevertheleſs under the appearances of death, becauſe the ſeparation of the two ſymbols repreſents the ſeparation of his body and blood. And in this there is a manifeſt reſemblance to the ſecond ſparrow, that was let go, after it had been ſprinkled with the blood of the ſacrifice; and to the ſecond goat, that was not ſlain but driven into the deſert, in which ſtate it was looked upon as dead, inaſmuch as it was for ever ſeparated from the living.

---

* Levit. i. 3. xvi. 15. Heb. xiii. 11.
† Levit. xvi. 15, 20. Levit. xiv. 49, 53.

Q. Did no figure in the ancient ſacrifices repreſent that bread and wine would be the matter of the ſacrifice of the Chriſtian Church?

A. It was with this view that God eſtabliſhed ſacrifices, in which an offering was made of cakes of flour, and of libations of wine on the altar. * The offering of the loaves of propoſition may be ſaid to have the ſame relation. But nothing is ſo clear concerning the matter of our ſacrifice, as the bread and wine uſed in that of Melchiſedech. † For this ſacrificer was always an illuſtrious figure of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. Now the Holy Spirit mentions nothing but bread and wine in Melchiſedech's ſacrifice. ‡ And this, undoubtedly, becauſe only bread and wine were deſigned to be the matter of the ſacrifice of the Chriſtian Church till the end of time.

Q. May not one ſay that the oblation of bread and wine by Melchiſedech, as related in the Holy Scripture, was made not to honor God by a ſacrifice, but for Abraham to refreſh his ſoldiers after their fatigue?

A. This is aſſerted not only without any proof found in the paſſage, but directly contrary to it. For the Holy Spirit mentions his quality of ſacrificer, to ſhew why Melchiſedech made an oblation of bread and wine. *Melchiſedech the king of Salem*, ſays Moſes, *bringing forth bread and wine; for he was the Prieſt of the Moſt High.* There was no neceſſity of his being a ſacrificer to give nouriſhment to the ſoldiers. If Abraham and his ſoldiers ate of this bread and drank of this wine, it was a ſacred repaſt, ſimilar to thoſe of the Iſraelites in their ſacrifices of proſperity. Melchiſedech, in quality of prieſt, offered this bread and wine in ſacrifice, to give thanks to God for Abraham's victory, and Abraham ate afterwards of the bread to partake of the ſacrifice, that had been made of it.

---

* Levit. ii. Exod. xxix. 40. Num. xv.
† Gen. xiv. 1, 8. ‡ Heb. vii.

Q. Do the words of St. Paul, on this ſubject ſupport this way of reaſoning?

A. This Apoſtle's manner of reaſoning compels us to look on every thing as myſterious, that Moſes ſays of Melchiſedech. The principle, by which he diſcovers the myſteries, which the Holy Spirit has concealed in his relation, is, that we ought to look on every thing that the Holy Scripture does not mention of Melchiſedech, as if it never had been, and what it ſays of him, as the only things we ought to attribute to him. As Melchiſedech appears in this part of Geneſis, where he is ſpoken of without any mention made there, or in any other place, either of his father, or children, or predeceſſors or ſucceſſors in the prieſthood, or of his birth or death; St. Paul ſpeaks of him as if he had neither father, nor children, nor predeceſſors, nor ſucceſſors, nor birth;* in which he is a figure perfectly adapted to repreſent the everlaſting exiſtence of Jeſus Chriſt, and the eternity of his prieſthood. We muſt argue on the ſame principle, in reaſoning concerning our ſubject. As the Holy Scripture neither in this place, nor elſewhere, mentions any other matter for Melchiſedech's prieſthood but bread and wine, we ought to look on theſe things as the matter of his ſacrifices; and it is in this that the ſacrifice of Melchiſedech, was the principal figure of that of the Chriſtian Church, in which bread and wine are uſed.

Q. To come now to the New Teſtament, has Jeſus Chriſt taught us there would be a ſacrifice in the Chriſtian Church?

A. He has ſaid to Chriſtians, *If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there ſhall remember that thy brother hath any thing againſt thee; leave there thy gift before the altar.* †

Q. Have you any other paſſage of the Goſpel, that is applicable to this point?

---

* Heb. vii. 3. † Matt. v. 23, 24.

A. Jeſus Chriſt likewiſe propoſed this truth to the Samaritan woman, when he taught her, that the adoration which the Jews aſſerted was to be given to God at Jeruſalem only, and the Samaritans on the contrary maintained, was to be paid to him on their mountain, would ſoon be paid to him in all places.* For it is clear, that by this adoration we muſt underſtand ſacrifice, ſince both the Jews and Samaritans acknowledged, that the other parts of God's worſhip might be paid to him in any part of the world, and their diſpute was only about that part of the adoration, which conſiſted in offering ſacrifice. Thus the difference betwixt the Old and New Teſtament, in this regard, does not conſiſt in this, that under the Old Teſtament, God was adored by the offering of ſacrifices, and that this adoration ſhould ceaſe under the New. According to our Lord, it conſiſts in this, that this adoration by ſacrifices was formerly confined to Jeruſalem, whereas it ſhould now be preſented to him in all parts of the univerſe.

Q. Does this paſſage ſupply any other reflection on this head?

A. I ſay, that as the word *to adore* is uſed in a ſynonimous ſenſe with that of ſacrifice, we may infer from this acceptation, that they, who have no ſacrifice, do not adore, that is to ſay, they have not the principal act of adoration. In this ſenſe, Catholics adore, becauſe they offer an external ſacrifice, and they adore in *ſpirit and truth*, becauſe at that ſolemn time, they are recollected in God to adore him in mind.

Q. Did the Apoſtles conſider the Euchariſt as a ſacrifice?

A. St. Paul ſays to the Corinthians, that *they that ſerve the altar partake with the altar.* † He teaches ſtill more clearly, in the thirteenth chapter to the Hebrews, that

---

* John iv. 20, 24. † 1 Cor. ix. 13.

there was an altar among the firſt Chriſtians. *It is beſt*, ſays he to them, *that the heart be eſtabliſhed with grace, not with meats: which have not profited thoſe that walk in them. We have an altar, whereof they have no power to eat who ſerve the tabernacle.* * The Apoſtles ſpeak here manifeſtly of an altar, on which the firſt Chriſtians offered an external viſible ſacrifice, that had ſucceeded the ancient ſacrifices. For he there contraſts the altar of the Chriſtians with that of the Jews, to which ſome wanted the new converts to return; the altar of the Chriſtians, to which the Jews could not be admitted, with that of the Jews, from which Chriſtians were excluded; the altar of the Chriſtians, where they partook of a food, that imparted grace to the ſoul, with the Jewiſh altar where the meats did not profit any thing, becauſe they did not confer grace, which is the true nouriſhment of the ſoul.

Q. Do we find in the Holy Scripture, that Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles ſaid Maſs?

A. The word Maſs is not in the Holy Scripture: it is taken from a Latin word, which the primitive Church had inſerted in the Liturgy, to acquaint the people that the Office was finiſhed, and that they might go away. But the Church might learn from the Holy Scripture to uſe the name of a part, to ſignify the whole. For example, in the Old Teſtament, the word *Ephraim* often ſignifies the ten Tribes; and in the New, the whole week is often ſignified by the word *Sabbath*.

Q. Give a more full anſwer to the queſtion I have propoſed.

A. When this queſtion is put, it is not certainly concerning the word *Maſs*, that you want us to produce a teſtimony from the Holy Scripture; ſuch a queſtion would be unworthy a Chriſtian: for there is no Chriſtian, who does not know, that all the words, which expreſs

* Heb. xiii. 9, 10.

even the moſt important truths of the Chriſtian Religion, as for example, that of *Sacrament*, and that of *Trinity*, are not in the Goſpel. In like manner, no one would certainly inſiſt on our having every word pointed out in the Holy Scripture, of which the Liturgy of the Maſs is compoſed. No Chriſtian Church ever pretended to ſhew in it all the words and ceremonies it employs in the celebration of the Holy Euchariſt. Thus when we are aſked to point out the Maſs in the Holy Scripture, this queſtion regards only the eſſence and ſubſtance of our holy myſteries, in the celebration of which the Church has eſtabliſhed ſome ceremonies and different prayers. Now I ſay, that this ſubſtance and eſſence is found in the Holy Scripture, and in this ſenſe we find there, that Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles ſaid Maſs.

Q. Prove what you have juſt advanced.

A. I ſay, the firſt Maſs was ſaid by our Lord, when he inſtituted the Holy Euchariſt. Our Lord then took bread and wine and bleſſed them: he made them his body and blood.* Thus he placed the victim, that expiates our ſins, upon the ſacred table, and put it there in the form of a victim, becauſe he made a myſtical ſeparation, by putting his body under the ſpecies of bread, and his blood under the ſpecies of wine. Thus the ſacred table became an altar, on which our Lord, having lifted up his eyes to heaven, expoſed to the view of his Father the victim of our reconciliation. He afterwards took it up from the altar to give to his Apoſtles to eat; they partook of theſe ſacred gifts, and recited a Canticle of thankſgiving. Theſe are the facts, we find in the account, which the Goſpel gives of the inſtitution of the Euchariſt: there is no Catholic that does not ſee here every thing, that is eſſential to the Maſs.

Q. Did the Apoſtles ſay Maſs, as well as Jeſus Chriſt?

* Matt. xxvi. 26.

A. St. Luke teaches this, when he ſays in the thirteenth chapter of the Acts, *as they were miniſtering to the Lord, the Holy Ghoſt ſaid to them: Separate me Saul and Barnabas.** For this miniſtration is what we mean, at this day, by the word Maſs. The ſame truth is found in the ſecond chapter of the ſame book, where he ſays, the firſt Chriſtians, *were perſevering in the doctrine of the Apoſtles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread and in prayers.*† That is to ſay, according to the language of theſe times, they aſſiduouſly attended at Maſs; for the Maſs is nothing but a compoſition of inſtructions and prayers, and of the celebration of the holy myſteries, of which St. Luke ſpeaks in this paſſage.

Q. Chriſtians then are bound to believe this doctrine of a ſacrifice.

A. St. Paul declares it to be a truth, in defence of which he was prepared to ſhed his blood. *If I be made a victim*, ſays he to the Philippians, *upon the ſacrifice and ſervice of your faith, I rejoice.*‡ The ſacrifice of the faith of Chriſtians, is the ſacrifices in which Chriſtians believe, as the *High Prieſt of our profeſſion*, § ſignifies in the third Chapter to the Hebrews, the ſovereign ſacrificer, in whom we profeſs a belief. St. Paul then ſpeaks in this verſe of a ſacrifice, that was the object of the faith of Chriſtians; but he there ſpeaks of it in a ſort of a tranſport of love, and affirms he ſhould be happy to lay down his life in ſupport of it. So that he may be ſaid to make a kind of libation upon this holy ſacrifice.

Q. How can the Euchariſt, in which there is no deſtruction of a victim, be a ſacrifice, ſince the Holy Scripture repreſents the deſtruction of a victim in all the ſacrifices?

A. On the contrary, the Holy Scripture ſpeaks of true ſacrifices, in which there was no deſtruction of the

---

* Acts xiii. 2.
† Acts 2. 42.
‡ Philip. ii. 17.
§ Heb. iii. 1.

victim: we find there for example, oblations made by the Iſraelities, of cakes of flour, on which they poured oil: * we likewiſe find the illuſtrious ſacrifice of Melchiſedech, in which nothing but bread and wine was uſed, † and which, for that reaſon, ſhould be looked on as the principal figure of the ſacrifice of the chriſtian Church.

Q. Was not the deſtruction of the victim neceſſary, at leaſt in all ſacrifices where any living thing was offered?

A. No. For in that for the lepers, one of the ſparrows, that was ſacrificed, was only deſtroyed by a myſtical deſtruction, ſince it was only dipped in the blood of the other, that was killed, and then let fly away. In the ſame manner, in the ſacrifice of the emiſſary goat, after it was charged with the ſins of the people, it was only driven into the deſert. Thus, according to the Holy Scripture, a ſimple oblation, ſuch as that of the cakes, and the oblation of a living creature with ſome repreſentation of death, which is what I call a myſtical deſtruction, was ſufficient for the eſſence of a true ſacrifice; this is found in the ſacrifice of the altar, where Jeſus Chriſt is in a living ſtate, but covered with the appearances of death, which are the ſpecies of his body and blood.

Q. Is the ſacrifice of the altar only of the nature of thoſe you have mentioned, in which there is no effuſion of blood?

A. No. For this ſacrifice does not differ from that of the croſs; we ought rather to compare it to the bloody ſacrifices, in which the immolation preceded the oblation: the victims were immolated out of the tabernacle, and afterwards carried and placed upon the altar to be offered to God. ‡ Of this kind was the calf, or he-goat, that was offered for ſin. In regard of the Chriſtian ſacrifice, the immolation was made on the croſs, and the oblation

---

* Levit 2. † Gen. xiv. 18. ‡ Levit i, 3, xvi. 15, 27.

is continued every day. So that the ſacrifice of the croſs, and that of the altar, are only one and the ſame ſacrifice.

Q. If Jeſus Chriſt offered himſelf every day in the Euchariſt, Saint Paul would not ſay, as he often does in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, that he only offered himſelf once, and that by this one oblation he ſanctified the faithful.

A. The Apoſtle ſpeaks only of the viſible bloody oblation, by which Jeſus Chriſt expiated our ſins. For he contraſts this oblation once made, with the repeated immolations of the ancient victims; and he ſays that to repeat the bloody oblation of our Saviour, *he ought to have ſuffered often, from the beginning of the world.* He even expreſsly obſerves, that the oblation he ſpeaks of, is that, in which our Lord bore the ſins of mankind, and paid the price of them; which only regards the bloody oblation of the croſs. *

Q. Does not St. Paul mean to tell us, that this bloody oblation excludes the other oblations of our Lord, of whatever kind they may be?

A. No. For he teaches us, in the ſame chapter, that our Lord is entered into heaven, that he may appear in the preſence of God for us. Since it is not contrary to this oblation once made on the croſs, that our Lord ſhould offer himſelf in heaven, ſo likewiſe it does not hinder his offering himſelf in the ſame manner to his father in the Euchariſt. When the High Prieſt offered in the holy of holies, the blood of the victim, that had been ſlain, he did not make a new ſacrifice. Our Lord, in offering himſelf continually to his Father in heaven, does not make a new ſacrifice. So when Jeſus Chriſt offers, every day on the altar, by the miniſtry of his Prieſts, his body, that was immolated on the croſs, he does not make a new ſacrifice; for the offering of a victim previouſly ſlain, is not a different ſacrifice; it is only a principal part of it, or more properly, a continuation of the ſame ſacrifice.

* Heb. ix. 12—28, x. 1—14

Q. As there is no effuſion of blood in the Euchariſt, why do you ſay it is a propitiatory ſacrifice: for St. Paul teaches, in this ſame Epiſtle to the Hebrews, that there is no remiſſion of ſins without the effuſion of blood?

A. We cannot ſay, that the remiſſion of ſins acquired by our holy ſacrifice, is obtained without the effuſion of blood. For it is only by virtue of the effuſion of our Lord's blood on the croſs, that we obtain this remiſſion. All Chriſtians, in the ſame manner, believe, that by baptiſm, we obtain the remiſſion of ſins,* though there be not preſent any effuſion of blood, becauſe it is obtained by virtue of the paſt effuſion of the blood of Jeſus Chriſt. Thus, to anſwer directly to the difficulty, I ſay that, according to the Holy Scripture, the propitiation and expiation of ſin, cannot be acquired without the real effuſion of blood; but I likewiſe add, that according to the ſame ſcripture, this propitiation may be applied ſeveral ways, without a preſent effuſion of blood, as by baptiſm, and particularly by the ſacrifice of the holy Euchariſt. And it is on account of this application of the blood of Jeſus Chriſt, made therein to the ſouls of the faithful, that we ſay the Euchariſt is a propitiatory ſacrifice; that is to ſay, a ſacrifice that renders God propitious to men.

Q. If the Euchariſt were a ſacrifice, St. Paul would have remarked it in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, which is a kind of treatiſe on the ſubject of ſacrifice. That would have been one of the beſt methods of comforting the Jews, for the loſs of their ſacrifices, which this Epiſtle ſhews were aboliſhed. How happened it, that the Apoſtle did not tell them they would every day behold the celebration of one more excellent in the Chriſtian Church.?

A. Saint Paul did ſo, as I have already ſhewn. For in the thirteenth chapter to the Hebrews, he exhorts

* Acts ii. 38.

them to ſeek comfort in grace, and not in meats, which had been of little advantage to thoſe that were attached to them, namely in the repaſts of the Jewiſh ſacrifices, and to reflect that if Chriſtians could not partake of the Jewiſh ſacrifices, the Jews in like manner could not partake of that of Chriſtians. *We have*, ſays he to them, *an altar whereof they have no power to eat, who ſerve the tabernacle.* This was ſufficient to excite the idea of the holy ſacrifice in the minds of the faithful, who had been inſtructed concerning it.

Q. Why did not the Apoſtle explain himſelf ſtill more clearly concerning this ſubject?

A. We are often ignorant of the reaſons, why the Apoſtles did not explain themſelves more amply concerning certain ſubjects in particular places, that ſeem to have a connection with them. But we may conjecture there were ſeveral Chriſtians among the Hebrews, to whom this Epiſtle was addreſſed, who had never received the Holy Euchariſt, and had not been inſtructed concerning it. For Saint Paul expreſsly complains they could not bear ſtrong meats, and that they had need of being taught the firſt rudiments of the faith in Jeſus Chriſt. Now it was uſual in the primitive Church to ſpeak of myſteries, in general and obſcure terms, before perſons who as yet were not fully inſtructed, that they who were inſtructed might comprehend their meaning, and the others underſtand nothing till they were better prepared.

CHAP. XI.

Of the Uſe of the Cup.

Q. HAVE Proteſtants any cauſe to reproach the Church with having retrenched the uſe of the Cup?

A. Far from it: for they themſelves have retrenched the moſt eſſential parts of the Holy Euchariſt.

Q. Prove this.

A. The body of Jeſus Chriſt is really in the ſacred ſymbols, and yet the Reformers have retrenched the preſence of his ſacred body, which is the moſt eſſential part of the Euchariſt.

Q. What other change have the Reformers made in this auguſt ſacrament?

A. Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles took bread and wine for the ſymbols of the Euchariſt; but the Reformers have declared of their own private authority, that in thoſe places where there is neither bread nor wine, the Euchariſt may be celebrated, by taking for a ſymbol any thing which in that country ſupplies the place of bread, or is commonly uſed for drink. *

Q. Have the Reformers retrenched any thing elſe from the Euchariſt?

A. They have moreover retrenched the quality of ſacrifice, which the new Teſtament aſcribes to the Euchariſt in thoſe paſſages, which inform us that Chriſtians have an altar, that is to ſay, a place on which they offer a ſacrifice. *We have*, ſays St. Paul, *an altar, whereof the Jews, who ſerve the tabernacle, have no power to eat.* †

Q. Continue the account of the retrenchments which the Reformers have made from the Holy Euchariſt.

A. The word of God repreſents Jeſus Chriſt bleſſing the ſymbols of the Euchariſt; but the French reformed church has laid aſide this benediction by which they are ſanctified.

Q. What conſecration do they make upon their ſymbols?

A. They only ſay: *The bread which we break, is the partaking of the body of Jeſus Chriſt; the chalice of benedic-*

---

* Beza, epiſt. 11. ad Thomam Frei. & epiſt. 25. Du Moul. Nouveaute du Pap. & Bouclier de la Foy 76. Rivet in Grat. Drel. Fauſh, Part 144.

† Heb. xiii. 10.

tion which we bleſs, is the communion of the blood of Jeſus Chriſt. Theſe are the words, in which St. Paul tells us what is the nature of the Holy Euchariſt, and not the words, by which it is conſecrated. Thus the ſaying that the Holy Euchariſt is the means, by which we partake of the body of Jeſus Chriſt, is not a conſecration of the Euchariſt.

Q. Do they pronounce this new formulary of benediction over all the ſymbols they diſtribute?

A. They do not even ſay this over any more than the firſt cup; for when it is conſummated by the firſt Communicants, they give the others wine, that hath not been bleſſed at all. It is true that ſome of their miniſters ſay, when they diſtribute it: *This is the blood of Jeſus Chriſt*; but without any deſign of conſecrating it by thoſe words. For which reaſon ſome of them never ſay them, as they are allowed by an expreſs article of their diſcipline, and they barely exhort the Communicants, to remember the death of Jeſus Chriſt; * and at Geneva itſelf, at the beginning of the reformation, they ſaid nothing during the diſtribution of the ſymbols.

Q. What do you conclude from thence?

A. I ſay that the Reformers having retrenched the conſecration of the cup, and even of both the ſymbols, on them, properly ſpeaking, the guilt falls of having aboliſhed the uſe of the Chalice, not to ſay that they have totally annihilated the Euchariſt, for unconſecrated ſymbols are not the Euchariſt inſtituted by our Lord.

Q. Are they guilty of any other retrenchments in this matter?

A. The word of God informs us, that the Apoſtles diſtributed the Euchariſt, or, as St. Luke ſays, *broke bread from houſe to houſe.* † But the French Reformers have retrenched the communion from thoſe, who, by

---

* Ch. 12. Art. 8. Obſerv. ſur l. art. 9. de la Diſcipline.

† Acts ii. 46.

infirmity, are confined to their houſes, and the Engliſh alſo, in caſe they have no one to communicate with them. This is retrenching it from ſuch as are in the greateſt want of it, namely, the ſick who frequently cannot be removed out of their beds for many years together. This is retrenching it from all Chriſtians at a time when moſt neceſſary for them, that is, at the hour of death.

Q. Are theſe all the retrenchments you reproach the Reformers with, on the ſubject of the Euchariſt?

A. The word of God teaches us, that the firſt Chriſtians were not leſs diligent in communicating, than they were in receiving inſtructions, or in ſaying their prayers. *They were perſevering*, ſays St. Luke, *in the doctrine of the Apoſtles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread, and in prayers.** But the followers of Calvin's Reformation have deprived every body of the Euchariſt for the greateſt part of the year. For amongſt them you can only communicate from three months to three months, how ardent ſoever may be your deſire of receiving, or however preſſing your wants.

Q. What do you think of the retrenchments you have charged them with, when compared to that they object to the Church, in regard of the ſacred chalice?

A. It is eaſy to find traces of communion in one kind, both in the Holy Scripture and in all ages of the Church. But there are no veſtiges of the retrenchments made by the Reformers, either in the Scripture, or the practice of the Church throughout all paſt ages. Theſe then muſt be retrenchments we ſhould look on as eſſential retrenchments.

Q. Are theſe the only errors of the reformed Churches relating to the Euchariſt, that deprive them of all kind of right to inſtruct other Chriſtians in the uſe of the chalice?

---

* Acts xi. 42.

A. I obſerve further, that as they cannot tell in their principles, what is the ſubſtance of the ſacred chalice, they cannot claim our attention when they ſpeak of its diſpenſation.

Q. Why do you ſay they cannot tell, according to their principles, what is the ſubſtance of the ſacred chalice?

A. Their principle is, that nothing is certain in Religion, but what is evidently taught in the word of God. They cannot then tell whether we ſhould put water or wine into the cup; for there is no paſſage of the Holy Scripture evidently clear concerning this point.

Q. Does not our Lord ſay, *I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, till the kingdom of God come.* *

A. The Holy Scripture does not clearly point out whether theſe words were pronounced before or after the inſtitution of the Euchariſt. In St. Matthew and St. Mark they are related after, but in St. Luke they are related before, who, as appears from the diſtinction he makes of the Paſchal ſupper, and that of the Euchariſt, intended to give a more exact and full relation than the other Evangeliſts, of what paſſed at this laſt repaſt of the Saviour of the world, and who expreſsly ſays, the inſtitution of the Euchariſt was after the words we are ſpeaking of. For after the relation of them, he adds, *and*, or, as thoſe of Geneva have tranſlated it, *afterwards he took bread and broke it.*

Q. What do you infer from this reflection?

A. I ſay, if theſe words, *I will not drink of the fruit of the vine*, were according to St. Luke's relation, pronounced before the inſtitution of the Euchariſt, there is not any paſſage in the Scripture, that points out the liquor to be uſed in the Chalice. The Reformed Churches, who profeſs they have no certainty of what the word of God does not evidently teach, cannot then tell whether water or wine ſhould be uſed in the ſacred

* Luke xxii. 18.

cup. No Chriſtian would ever drink of it, were he to defer till they had ſhewn by their principles what ought to be the matter of it. For this reaſon I ſay, becauſe they cannot tell what is the ſubſtance of the ſacred Chalice, they do not deſerve our attention when they ſpeak of the diſpenſation of it.

Q. Having proved from the Holy Scripture, how much the Reformed are miſled in this point, ſhew us from the ſame Scripture, that no one can here juſtly lay any thing to the charge of Catholics. Why did you ſay there were traces in the Holy Scripture of communion under one kind?

A. It appears there, that the Holy Ghoſt has been attentive to repreſent the Holy Euchariſt under one and the other form of communion, to teach the faithful, that to communicate under both kinds, or to communicate under one only, were two equally good ways of partaking of the Holy Euchariſt: and moreover, as this way of communicating would be attacked by innovators, the Holy Ghoſt has been pleaſed to repreſent the Euchariſt more frequently under one than both kinds.

Q. To come to particular proofs of what you have ſaid, pleaſe to ſpeak firſt of the ſixth chapter of St. John, where this myſtery of the Holy Euchariſt is promiſed. Is there any paſſage in this chapter, in which our Lord intimates that communion under one kind is good, as well as communion under both.

A. Yes. For if mention is made ſeveral times of eating the fleſh, and drinking the blood of Jeſus Chriſt, mention is likewiſe made of eating ſeparately; and the ſame promiſes, that are given to eating and drinking, are there given to the eating only. *If any man*, ſays our Lord, *eat of this bread, he ſhall live for ever: the bread that I will give is my fleſh. He that eateth me, the ſame alſo ſhall live by me. He that eateth this bread ſhall live for ever.* *

* John vi. 52—59.

Q. Do the other Evangeliſts likewiſe ſometimes repreſent the communion under one kind only?

A. As we ſee two kinds in the firſt Euchariſt our Lord celebrated before his death, ſo on the other ſide the Holy Ghoſt hath only ſhewn us one in the ſecond Euchariſt, which the Saviour of the world celebrated after his Reſurrection with the two Diſciples, that were going to Emmaus: *Whilſt he was at table with them*, ſays St. Luke, *he took bread, and bleſſed and brake, and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him: And theſe two Diſciples told what things were done in the way, and how Jeſus Chriſt had made himſelf known to them in the breaking of bread.* *

Q. Is this paſſage to be underſtood of the Euchariſt?

A. Yes. For, in the ſtyle of the New Teſtament, the breaking of bread always ſignifies the Euchariſt, and particularly in St. Luke's writings. Beſides it is manifeſt, that this breaking diſcovered our Lord to his Diſciples only by the effect of a grace, with which our Lord was pleaſed to accompany this ſacrament, which is the ordinary channel of it; and by the obſervation of the Apoſtles, who knew that this celebration of the myſteries was entirely unknown to the reſt of mankind. For which reaſon the two Diſciples laid a ſtreſs on this circumſtance of the breaking of bread, in which they had diſcovered the Lord, as on a ſingular incident. So Calvin owns that St. Auguſtin, and ſeveral other Fathers underſtood this paſſage of the Holy Euchariſt: and adds from himſelf, that it will appear pleaſing, to ſay that Jeſus Chriſt was diſcovered in the ſpiritual mirror of the ſupper. † The Sacrament, ſays a Miniſter author of the *Practice of Piety*, is the Holy Bread, which, after it was eaten, opened the eyes of thoſe of Emmaus, to know Jeſus Chriſt. ‡

---

* Luke xxiv. 30—35.

† On S. Luke xxiii. 30.

‡ c. 39. p. 332.

Q. Is this the only place, in which St. Luke repreſents the communion under one kind only?

A. We find the ſame thing in the Acts of the Apoſtles: in every place where he ſpeaks of the Holy Euchariſt, he never repreſents it but under the ſpecies of bread alone. In his ſecond chapter he ſpeaks twice of the Euchariſt of the firſt Chriſtians of Jeruſalem. In the twentieth chapter he ſpeaks of the Euchariſt of the Chriſtians of Troas, of whom Eutichus was one, mentioning in all theſe places only the ſpecies of bread. *When they were aſſembled, ſays he, to break bread:* * *They broke bread from houſe to houſe:* † *They were perſevering together in the doctrine of the Apoſtles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread, and in prayers.* ‡ This is not the language of one, who looked on communion under the ſpecies of bread only as unlawful; ſo we ſee the Miniſters, who view it in this light, never repreſent their ſupper by the ſpecies of bread alone; one never hears them ſay, we will aſſemble to partake of the bread of the Euchariſt; I was preſent to day at the preaching, and the breaking of bread, and at prayers.

Q. Has St. Paul likewiſe, in ſpeaking of the Euchariſt, repreſented it under one kind only?

A. In the eleventh chapter of the firſt to the Corinthians, where he ſpeaks ſeveral times of eating this bread, and drinking this cup, in one verſe he has theſe words: *Whoſoever ſhall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, ſhall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.* §

Q. Why did not St. Paul ſay here, *whoſoever ſhall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord,* as in the other verſes?

---

* Acts xx. 7. † Acts ii. 46. ‡ Ibid. 42.

§ 1 Cor. xi. 27. Here the Proteſtant verſion is corrupted, by putting *and* drink, (contrary to the original η πινη) inſtead of *or* drink.

A. To intimate that there were even then occaſions, in which the communicants received only one of the ſpecies, as likewiſe to teach us, that as by receiving one kind only unworthily, we are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, ſo by worthily receiving one kind only, we profitably partake of the body and blood of the Lord; ſo that our ſolicitude ought not to be about the number of kinds we receive, but the diſpoſitions, with which we receive this auguſt Sacrament, as the Church offers it to us, either under both kinds, or under one only.

Q. May not one ſay of moſt of the paſſages you have appealed to, that where one ſpecies only is mentioned, the other is underſtood?

A. One may ſay it without a poſſibility of proving it from the Scripture, which the Proteſtants have bound themſelves to. Beſides, though it were ſo, the force of the proof in theſe paſſages would not be weakened. For the Holy Ghoſt, who knew that communion under one kind would one day be approved by the Church, would not in ſo many places have repreſented communion under the ſpecies of bread alone, if this manner of communicating were impious and contrary to ſalvation. The Miniſters, who condemn communion under one kind, would not deſcribe it under one kind only, on account of thoſe, who look on this manner of communicating as unlawful. The Holy Ghoſt, to whom theſe people were preſent by his foreknowledge, would never have propoſed the Euchariſt under the ſpecies of bread alone, if the reception of this kind alone had been impious.

Q. What concluſion do you draw from all your obſervations on the paſſages of the New Teſtament concerning this ſubject?

A. That Catholics, who approve the two manners of communicating, are the Chriſtians, who conform to the Holy Scripture, which approves of the one and the other. That on the contrary the Proteſtants who allow of com-

munion under both kinds, but condemn it under one kind, are in oppoſition to the word of God, ſince they approve of only one part of what the Holy Scripture approves.

Q. Why is it not eſſential to receive both the ſpecies in communion?

A. Becauſe we find even in one the principal uſes, for which the Holy Scripture teaches us, that the Holy Euchariſt was inſtituted; thus it is known, that immerſion is not neceſſary in Baptiſm, becauſe in pouring the water on the child, we find the principal uſe, for which water was ordered to be uſed in this ſacrament, that is, a repreſentation of the grace, which cleanſes us from ſin.

Q. Prove that we find in the Holy Euchariſt, received under one kind only, the principal uſes, for which this Sacrament was inſtituted.

A. The Euchariſt was inſtituted, that we might receive the body and blood of Jeſus Chriſt, * and we find both the one and the other in each of the two ſpecies, as the body and blood of the Saviour of the world cannot be ſeparated any more; becauſe, as St. Paul ſays, *He dieth now no more.* † The Euchariſt was inſtituted to impart to us the grace merited by Jeſus Chriſt. ‡ This grace is wholly communicated to us in each of the ſpecies, as it is not a ſenſible object divided between the two. Laſtly, the Euchariſt was inſtituted to be a memorial of the death of Jeſus Chriſt, and nothing hinders the faithful, who receive one kind only, from applying their minds in a lively manner to this commemoration; and the reception of the ſecond is not neceſſary for the acquittal of this duty: for which reaſon our Lord having diſtributed the conſecrated bread, ſaid immediately, without waiting for the conſecration of the Chalice, *do this for a commemoration of me.* §

---

* John vi. † Rom. vi. 9. ‡ John vi. 56.
§ Luke xxii. 19. 1 Cor. xi. 24.

Q. Is there likewiſe any mark to be found in the Old Teſtament, of communion under one kind?

A. We ſee there, that the faithful of the Old Teſtament, who partook only of the Lamb, that had been immolated for them, nevertheleſs received the whole effect of the ſacrifice. With how much more reaſon may we ſay, Chriſtians will partake of the ſacrifice of the Lamb of God, who takes away the ſins of the world, when they receive only the ſpecies of bread, in which the blood is united to the body.

Q. Is there not in the Old Teſtament ſomething elſe applicable to this ſubject?

A. We may there likewiſe obſerve, that, in regard of the manna, and the water of the rock, which were very diſtinctive figures of the body and blood of our Lord as preſent in the Holy Euchariſt, for our ſpiritual nouriſhment, the Jews did not keep the water in the ark, but the manna only, * as Catholics reſerve the ſacred bread in their tabernacles, and not the conſecrated wine.

Q. Though the Scripture ſhould not even ſay any thing, as Proteſtants pretend, to induce us to approve of communion under one kind, could they juſtly condemn it?

A. They believe ſeveral things, which the Scripture does not teach them. It does not ſay, for example, that the impoſition of hands ſhould be diſcontinued in the Church, which Chriſtians received after Baptiſm, and which we now call Confirmation, † yet this has been aboliſhed by many of the reformed churches: it does not ſay, the ſacred unction ſhould be laid aſide, which the primitive Church adminiſtered to the ſick for the recovery of the health of their bodies, and particularly for the remiſſion of their ſins: ‡ yet this alſo has been aboliſhed without heſitation. And in regard of the impoſition of hands, which the Holy Scripture repreſents in all the

* Heb. ix 4. † Acts viii. 17. ‡ Jam. v. 14.

ordinations of the Apoſtolic times, many of them have, without the authority of any paſſage of the Holy Scripture, declared it an unneceſſary ceremony, not pertaining to the ſubſtance of ordination, and called the contrary belief ſuperſtitious. For which reaſon, in ſome of the Proteſtant Churches, the impoſition of hands was omitted in the ordination of their miniſters. *

What do you conclude from hence?

A. That they, who totally aboliſh ſeveral ſacraments manifeſtly eſtabliſhed in the Holy Scripture, have little right to reproach the Church with laying aſide the uſe of the ſacred chalice in the holy Euchariſt. Thus the Reformers, who declare, without ſupporting it by any paſſage of the word of God, that the impoſition of hands, ſo ſolidly eſtabliſhed in it, is not eſſential to ordination, ſhould not aſſert that the union of both kinds is eſſential to the ſacrament of the Euchariſt, becauſe the union of the chalice with the ſacred bread is propoſed in the word of God. For after having retrenched the impoſition of hands, which was received after Baptiſm, which is expreſsly ſaid, in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, to appertain to the foundation of the chriſtian religion, as faith, penance, baptiſm, the articles of the reſurrection, and of the laſt judgement, † they ſhould bluſh to reproach the Church with the retrenchment of the chalice, which the Holy Ghoſt never thus pronounced eſſential or fundamental.

Q. Can you ſhew concerning the Euchariſt in particular, that all which Chriſtians practice is not found in the Holy Scripture?

A. It is impoſſible to have a certain knowledge from the Holy Scripture, that we are not bound to adminiſter the Euchariſt to infants, by the force of theſe words: *Except you eat my fleſh, and drink my blood, you ſhall not*

---

* Synod de Paris et de la Rech. dans la Diſcipline obſer. ſur le chap. 1, art. 8. † Heb. vi. 1. 2.

have life: eat, for this is my body, drink ye all of the cup. Nothing can be more unreaſonable, than upon this occaſion, to allege the duty of commemorating our Lord's death, in the holy Euchariſt, which infants are not capable of doing; ſince they are equally incapable of being inſtructed in faith and repentance, belonging, by the authority of the Holy Ghoſt, to the ſacrament of Baptiſm, which is, notwithſtanding, adminiſtered to them.* We are not aſſured by the Holy Scripture, that Laymen cannot conſecrate the Euchariſt. It does not evidently teach, that prieſts of an inferior order have that power. For at the inſtitution, Jeſus Chriſt ſpeaks only to the Apoſtles, who were the firſt Biſhops of the Church. The Holy Scripture does not manifeſtly ſay what prayers or words are neceſſary for the conſecration of the ſymbols. We may add, for the Proteſtants in particular, that they have judged thoſe words neceſſary for Baptiſm, which were appointed by Jeſus Chriſt at its eſtabliſhment, ſince they would not attempt to baptize without theſe words, *I baptize thee, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt;* and that they have not regarded as neceſſary for the Euchariſt, the words ſpoken by Jeſus Chriſt in the inſtitution of it; ſince in many places they have left it to the option of their Miniſters, to ſay what they pleaſe at the diſtribution of it. At Geneva, they diſtribute it in profound ſilence, and this without being able to ſupport either one or the other way, by evident declarations of the Holy Scripture. Thus there being ſeveral practices, which are regulated without the direction of any clear lights of the goſpel, it is manifeſt, that the Church may regulate the diſpenſation of the chalice, though the goſpel ſhould not have, in any manner, intimated a liberty of abſtaining from it.

Q. Proteſtants pretend that the Holy Scripture is ſo

* Mat. xxviii. 19. Mark xvi. 16. Acts ii. 38.

far from countenancing communion under one kind, that it even condemns it; in proof of which they cite the words of Jeſus Chriſt, *Drink ye all of this.**

A. It is not clear, that theſe words are addreſſed to all the faithful. For every body acknowledges, that ſeveral of our Lord's diſcourſes, even in the inſtitution of the Euchariſt, regard only the Apoſtles. There are ſome, that relate only to the miniſters of the Church, ſuch are theſe words: *Do this for a commemoration of me,* † which are the only words in the Holy Scripture, by which the ſacred miniſters can pretend to ſhew an excluſive commiſſion of conſecrating the Euchariſt.

Q. What do you conclude from this?

A. That as there are in our Lord's words addreſſed to the Apoſtles, and in particular in thoſe of the inſtitution of the Holy Euchariſt, ſome commands intended for all Chriſtians, and others only for their Conductors; we cannot know from the conſideration of theſe words alone, *Drink ye all of it,* whether they are deſigned for all Chriſtians, or only for the ſacred miniſters. We muſt go elſewhere, and particularly, as our Lord ſends us, to the doctrine of the Church, to be informed what there is in the inſtitution of the Euchariſt neceſſary for the one and what for the other.

Q. Can one learn from any other paſſage, what our Lord meant by the word *all,* in this ſentence, *Drink ye all of it?*

A. That we may not recur to a great number of paſſages, in which this word is only underſtood of the twelve Apoſtles, I only obſerve that St. Mark reſtrains it to them alone, in his recital of the inſtitution of the Holy Euchariſt: *And they all drank of it,* ‡ ſays he, ſpeaking of the twelve Diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt. We ought not to extend the meaning of theſe words of our Lord, *drink ye all of it,* farther than St. Mark has done

* Matt. xxvi. 27. † Luke xxii. 19. ‡ Mark xiv. 23.

in the following, *and they all drank of it.* The precept contained in the firſt ſentence, moſt manifeſtly extended only to thoſe included in the laſt.

Q. Why does our Lord ſay to his Apoſtles, *drink ye all of it*, in giving them the cup, and does not ſay, *eat ye all of it*, in giving the conſecrated bread?

A. Becauſe in giving them the conſecrated bread, he preſented to each the part he was to eat; whereas he only preſented them one cup, which they were to divide among them; thus, *drink ye all of it*, in the Holy Scripture ſignifies the ſame thing as thoſe other words, which our Lord addreſſed for the ſame reaſon to the Apoſtles, when he preſented the legal cup. *Take and divide it among you.* *

Q. If theſe words, *drink ye all of it*, were addreſſed to all the faithful, would it follow that they could not lawfully communicate without receiving the ſacred chalice?

A. It muſt be farther ſhewn, that this precept includes ſomething eſſential: for there certainly are ſeveral precepts in the Holy Scripture, that are not eſſentially binding. Jeſus Chriſt, for example, ſaid to his Diſciples, *If then I being your Lord and Maſter, have waſhed your feet, you alſo ought to waſh one another's feet: For I have given you an example, that as I have done to you, ſo you do alſo.* † Our Lord even ſpoke in this manner after he had told St. Peter, that without this waſhing he ſhould have no part with him. Yet it is agreed, the Apoſtles did not regard this command of waſhing one another's feet as abſolutely neceſſary. And the Church teaching, that Jeſus Chriſt did not then inſtitute a Sacrament of humility, it is not believed to be of indiſpenſable obligation. In the ſame manner the Apoſtles aſſembled at Jeruſalem prohibit the eating of blood, calling their prohibition a *neceſſary thing*, and join it to

* Luke xxii. 17. † John xiii. 14, 15.

that of idolatry and fornication.* Yet in regard of this prohibition the teſtimony of the Church is depended on, which reſtrains the neceſſity to the firſt ages of Chriſtianity, when charity required great condeſcendence to the weakneſs of the Jews.

Q. What you have ſaid does not relate to a Sacrament. But may one believe, that all our Lord's injunctions in the inſtitution of a Sacrament, are not abſolutely indiſpenſable?

A. Jeſus Chriſt ſays, *Go, teach all nations, dipping them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.*† For the Greek word tranſlated by, *to baptize*, properly ſignifies to *dip*, as Calvin ſays on this ſubject. This immerſion is confirmed by the example of the Jews baptized by St. John, in a place where there was much water;‡ by the baptiſm of our Lord in the Jordan, § and that of the Eunuch of the Queen of Ethiopia, who went down into the water, where he was baptized by St. Philip. ‖ We do not ſee any example clearly expreſſed in the Holy Scripture of Baptiſm adminiſtered in any other manner, except by immerſion or dipping, though we conjecture with reaſon, that the three thouſand Jews, who were converted by the firſt ſermon of St. Peter after the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt, and the five thouſand by the ſecond, were baptized by aſperſion, as it does not appear there was ſufficient time to baptize ſo great a number by immerſion, in one day; an example, which ſhews the Apoſtles did not underſtand the words of Jeſus Chriſt concerning immerſion, as if it were neceſſary, but that any ablution was ſufficient; which juſtifies the conduct of St. Francis Xavier, in the Indies, who uſed aſperſion in caſe of neceſſity. Moreover, we do not any longer commonly practiſe dipping, and Proteſtants maintain that it is not neceſ-

---

* Acts xv. 28, 29. † Matt. xxviii. 19. ‡ John iii. 23.
§ Matt. iii. 16. ‖ Acts viii. 38.

ſary. * They cannot then conſiſtently maintain, that all our Lord's commands in the inſtitution of a Sacrament are indiſpenſable. I cannot ſee any connection in their doctrine on this ſubject. They will have it, that the union of the two ſpecies, found in the words and example of our Lord, in regard of the Euchariſt, is eſſential; and yet they will not allow that immerſion, which is likewiſe recommended in regard of Baptiſm, by the command and example of our Lord, is eſſential. If they would conſider theſe two points impartially, they would acknowledge, that they cannot ſhew from the Holy Scripture, that it is more eſſential in the Euchariſt, to make uſe of the holy chalice, by drinking it, than it is eſſential in Baptiſm to uſe the water by immerſion. The water of which the Proteſtants receive ſome drops on their faces in Baptiſm, is not applied to their bodies, in the manner pointed out by the Holy Scripture, which only ſpeaks of dipping. In the ſame manner, the precious cup, which the faithful only ſee, is not received by them in the form pointed out by the Holy Scripture, which only ſpeaks of drinking it. There is not, in this regard, any Theology conſiſtent with itſelf, but that of Catholics, which equally relies on the teſtimony of the Church, both when it ſays, that our Lord's command, reſpecting immerſion, does not enjoin a form abſolutely eſſential for the reception of Baptiſm, and when it teaches, that our Lord's injunction concerning the chalice, does not point out a form abſolutely eſſential for the reception of the chalice.

Q. Does it not ſeem that theſe two things ſhould not be compared together, ſince the preſenting of the Chalice with the conſecrated bread, repreſents the ſeparation of our Lord's body and blood, which bears a relation to the end of the Holy Euchariſt, which is the commemoration of the death of Jeſus Chriſt: where-

* Book of com. Prayer, Bapt. of ſuch as are of riper years. Confeſs. of faith of Scots, c. xxxviii. 3.

as in whatſoever manner baptiſm be adminiſtered, we ſtill behold water for the waſhing of the body, which repreſents the purification of the ſoul by the blood of Jeſus Chriſt?

A. The Chalice is likewiſe ſeen in the adminiſtration of the Holy Euchariſt, and ſerves to repreſent to the faithful the ſeparation of the blood of Jeſus Chriſt from his body. Beſides, the immerſion once uſed in Baptiſm, had alſo ſignifications bearing relation to the end of the ſacrament; ſince, according to St. Paul, it repreſented the death and reſurrection of our Lord, the death of the old man, and the reſurrection of the new. *We*, ſays this holy Apoſtle, *who have been baptized in the death of our Lord, have been buried together with him by baptiſm, to die to ſin: that as Jeſus Chriſt is riſen from the dead by the glory of his Father, ſo we may alſo walk in newneſs of life.** Yet, notwithſtanding all theſe ſignifications of this immerſion, the Church has been relied on, which tells us it is not abſolutely neceſſary. The ſignification then of the Chalice ought not to prevent our believing the Church, when it teaches that it is not neceſſary to receive it in communion; for that which makes the ſignification of a Sacrament, more lively and expreſſive, is not always eſſential.

Q. Have you any thing more to add on this compariſon of the Chalice with the immerſion, by which Baptiſm was at firſt adminiſtered?

A. The wiſdom of the Holy Ghoſt is much to be admired here. For as it was foreſeen, that Chriſtians of future ages would have leſs difficulty in admitting aſperſion or effuſion, which were ſubſtituted inſtead of immerſion in Baptiſm, there is no preciſe formal paſſage of Holy Scripture, that poſitively inſinuates any other manner of baptizing. But as communion under one kind was to meet with great oppoſition, the Holy Ghoſt

* Rom. vi. 4. Coloſs. ii. 12.

hath inſerted in the Holy Scripture a number of paſſages favorable to this manner of communicating. I allude to thoſe paſſages on the Euchariſt, which I have cited, where only one of the ſpecies is ſpoken of. Do they then reſpect the Holy Scripture, who ſubmit to the teſtimony of the Church concerning a change in the manner of baptizing, for which there is no clear authority in the word of God, and refuſe to yield to the ſame teſtimony in regard of a change in the manner of communicating, which is evidently authoriſed by the Holy Scripture?

Q. Have there not been ſome changes in this ſubject of the Euchariſt, even in things that bear a relation to its ſignification, which Proteſtants hold lawful?

A. The time of the evening, at which our Lord communicated, had likewiſe a particular relation to his death, which happened towards the evening, and to the time they uſually celebrated the paſſover, which was an ancient figure of this death. The unleavened bread, which our Lord uſed in the Euchariſt, had a manifeſt relation to the purity, with which we ought to approach to this auguſt ſacrament. This relation is even pointed out by St. Paul: *Jeſus Chriſt, our paſch, ſays he, is ſacrificed. Therefore let us feaſt, not with the old leaven, nor with the leaven of malice and wickedneſs, but with the unleavened bread of ſincerity and truth.** Yet, notwithſtanding theſe relations and circumſtances, Chriſtians have ſubmitted to the Church, when it taught, that this choice of unleavened bread and the time of the evening, that occurred in the inſtitution of the Euchariſt, were not eſſential. We ought then, notwithſtanding the relation, which the ſeparation of the bread, and of the chalice, has with that of the body and blood of our Lord, to believe the Church, when it teſtifies, that the receiving of the chalice is not abſolutely indiſpenſable.

* Cor. v. 7. 8.

Q. Are there not moreover ſome other changes in things related by the Holy Scripture, which Proteſtants do not condemn, though theſe things have a relation to the deſign and end of this ſacrament?

A. The breaking of the ſacred bread has an evident relation to our Lord's death; which he himſelf has plainly expreſſed, when he calls his dead body, *a broken body*. Yet Calviniſts do not look on this breaking as eſſential and indiſpenſable, as they have declared in their conferences with the Lutherans; and to this day they tolerate in the Lutherans, the omiſſion of this breaking of the ſacred bread, in whoſe doctrine and worſhip, their ſynods and all their doctors have agreed they could find no venom.* Formerly, I mean in the time of Calvin and Beza, the pretended Reformers communicated with the ſort of bread uſed by the Catholics; the cuſtom was only aboliſhed by the ſucceſſors of theſe firſt miniſters. And even at this day, in ſeveral of their churches, the pieces of bread, ſuch as every one receives them, are placed on the table, and the diſh being puſhed from one end to the other, each one takes his piece without receiving it from the hands of the miniſter. In like manner the ſeparation of the chalice and bread hath, as they inceſſantly repeat, an evident relation to the ſeparation of the body and blood of Jeſus Chriſt at his death.† Yet their doctors hold, that the Greeks do not omit any thing eſſential in the Euchariſt, though they give communion with a hoſt that has been dipped, or on which a drop of the ſacred blood has been poured, though it be grown quite dry, either by the fire or by being long kept. All the things then mentioned in the inſtitution, that bear a relation to the deſign and end of the Euchariſt, are not eſſential to it. It would be a mark of invincible partiality to contend,

---

* Colloq. Caſſel. an 1661. Synod. de Charen. Daille. Bochart.

† Deſpagne de la Manducation du Corps de J. C. p. 158, 161, and 162.

that the Greeks, who give a hoſt entirely dried, on which a drop of the blood had once been poured, have retained all things eſſential to the Euchariſt, and that Catholics have not, who give the ſame ſacred bread, without any drop of the ſacred cup.

Q. Our Lord hath ſaid himſelf, in expreſs terms, in St. John: *Except you eat the fleſh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you ſhall not have life in you.* *

A. Jeſus Chriſt intended, by theſe words, to repreſent the neceſſity of receiving his body and blood under that form, which was moſt uſual in his Church. This neceſſity regards the receiving of our Saviour's body and blood, and not the manner of receiving it. Thus our Lord having ſaid, *He that believeth and is dipped, ſhall be ſaved,* † hath promiſed ſalvation to Baptiſm, not to the manner of receiving it, that is, to the dipping. In the ſame manner, if he had ſaid, *He that is not dipped, ſhall not enter into the kingdom of heaven,* he would not have enjoined the neceſſity of dipping; but under this form of dipping, commonly uſed in the firſt ages, he would have repreſented the neceſſity of receiving Baptiſm. St. Paul ſpeaks after the ſame manner, when he ſays, that *The man ought not to cover his head, becauſe he is the image and glory of God.* ‡ Not that he intended to bind men in all ages and in all places, to ſhew in this manner the ſuperiority God had given them over women; but only, as the people, to whom he wrote had this cuſtom, he ſhewed, by this manner of expreſſion, that men and women ought always to bear the marks of their ſtate, that is, the men of their ſuperiority, and the women of their ſubmiſſion, though with conformity to the cuſtoms of the places and times, in which they live.

Q. Have you nothing to add on the paſſage which I objected to you, and on the diſcipline of the reformed

---

* John vi. 54. † Mark xvi. 16. ‡ 1 Cor. xi. 7.

Churches, that is clearly oppoſite to their principles on this article?

A. I will only add, that they ſhould not ſtart any difficulty from this paſſage on the ſubject of the Chalice, becauſe they believe the ſixth chapter of St. John is not to be underſtood of the Euchariſt.* But when we conſider their diſcipline in regard to the abſtemious, that is, of thoſe, who have an averſion to wine, one cannot ſee how they can allow them to communicate; for either they act contrary to the command of Jeſus Chriſt, by ſeparating the two ſpecies in their favor, or they own we may lawfully receive the effect of the Sacrament, by taking one kind only. Nor will it avail them to allege their natural averſion to wine, as a plea for this ſeparation; for if the union of the two kinds be eſſential, as they maintain, they ſhould exclude them from communion, rather than violate the precept of Jeſus Chriſt, by retrenching the Chalice; as the word of God does not expreſs any ſuch allowance in their favor.

---

* Art. 7. on the Supper.

THE TRUTH

OF THE

CATHOLIC RELIGION

PROVED FROM THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

Search the Scriptures, for you think in them to have life everlaſting; and the ſame are they that give teſtimony of me. St. John Chap. v. Verſe 39.

THIRD PART.

THE TRUTH

OF THE

CATHOLIC RELIGION

PROVED FROM THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

Search the Scriptures. For you think in them to have life everlasting: and the same are they that give testimony of me. St. John Chap. v. Verse 39.

THIRD PART.

THE TRUTH
OF THE
CATHOLIC RELIGION
PROVED FROM THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

PART III.

Of the Sacraments.

CHAP. I.

Of Baptiſm.

Q. HOW many Sacraments do we find in the word of God?

A. We there find ſeven, which are Baptiſm, Confirmation, Penance, the Holy Euchariſt, Extreme Unction, Order and Matrimony.

Q. Ought one to believe, that children, who die without Baptiſm, are ſaved?

A. It is not allowed to expect the ſalvation of any except of thoſe for whom God, who is free in the diſpenſation of his gifts,* plainly informs us in his word, he hath prepared it. Now the Holy Scripture does not any where ſay, that God will free infants, that are not baptiſed, from the malediction, under which it teaches us they fell through original ſin: *Who*, ſays Job, *can make him clean that is conceived of unclean ſeed.*† *I was conceived in iniquities*, ſays David, *and in ſins did my mother*

* Matt. xx. 23. † Job. xiv. 4.

conceive me. * *We were,* ſays St. Paul, *by nature children of wrath.* † Now there is not any paſſage of the Holy Scripture, in which it appears, that God will deliver Chriſtians from this wrath and this corruption, except by means of Baptiſm.

Q. Then thoſe err who ſay Baptiſm is not neceſſary.

A. So far are they from being able to produce any paſſage of the Holy Scripture, in ſupport of their opinion, that it is directly oppoſite to it. For Jeſus Chriſt ſays, *Except a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghoſt, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.* ‡ This paſſage relates to Baptiſm: for, to be *born of water,* ſignified, among the Jews, whoſe language our Lord borrows in this place, to become a member of religion, by complying with a duty neceſſary to ſalvation. So that *to be born of water and the Holy Ghoſt,* evidently ſignifies, in this paſſage, to be waſhed with the water of Baptiſm by the grace of the Holy Ghoſt, to enter by it into the Chriſtian Church, and thus to receive a new ſpiritual birth.

Q. If Baptiſm be neceſſary, what ſhould one do in the abſence of Prieſts, when children are in danger?

A. Thoſe, who have not the prieſtly character, ought then to adminiſter Baptiſm. So in the Old Teſtament, Sephora circumciſed her ſon, and the mercy immediately ſhewn to Moſes, proves how pleaſing this was to God. § In like manner the women of the Old Teſtament continued to circumciſe their children, in caſes of neceſſity, as we ſee in the time of the perſecution under Antiochus. ¶ And in the New Teſtament, when the Eunuch of Queen Candace was earneſtly deſirous of Baptiſm, St. Philip, who was only a deacon, baptiſed him on the road, as he was on his journey. ‖

Q. How can you aſſure us, that the Holy Scripture teaches, that the children of the faithful are not in a

---

* Pſ. l. 7. † Eph. ii. 3. ‡ John iii. 5. § Exod iv. 25.
¶ 1 Mach. i. 63. 2 Mach. vi. 10. ‖ Acts viii. 38.

ſtate to enter heaven before baptiſm. Does not St. Paul ſay: *That the children are holy from their mother's womb?*

A. Theſe words, *from their mother's womb*, are an addition, which ſome ſects have made to their liturgy of baptiſm, where they have preſumed to make St. Paul ſay: *That the children are holy from their mother's womb.* The paſſage is ſimply this, *The children of the faithful are holy.* *

Q. What is St. Paul's meaning in this paſſage?

A. In order to explain it, I will give the whole verſe. *The unbelieving huſband is ſanctified by the believing wife; and the unbelieving wife is ſanctified by the believing huſband: otherwiſe your children ſhould be unclean; but now they are holy.* It will here be proper to aſk what kind of ſanctity the marriage of the faithful party imparted to the unfaithful, ſince the holineſs of children intimated in this place is of the ſame nature; as alſo, what kind of uncleanneſs that is, in which the children would have been, if their unbelieving father had not been ſanctified by the believing mother; for the ſanctity aſcribed to them in this paſſage, is only a quality oppoſed to that kind of uncleanneſs. Whatever anſwer is returned, it will ſhew, that this paſſage does not evince, that children obtain the pardon of original ſin before Baptiſm.

Q. Explain this paſſage yourſelf.

A. He ſpeaks there, not of an internal ſanctity, that intitled them to heaven, but of a ſanctity of ſtate, by which a Chriſtian huſband might lawfully dwell with a Pagan wife, and the birth of their children become legitimate. *The unbelieving huſband is ſanctified by the believing wife.* How? Relatively to the uſe of marriage: as the Apoſtle proves by ſaying their children were holy, that is, lawfully begotten. In reality, if the uſe of marriage with an unbeliever had not become holy

* 1 Cor. vii. 14.

by the fidelity of the other party, the greater part of the children of Chriſtians in thoſe times, would have been the fruits of uncleanneſs. For which reaſon the Corinthians, who ſaw that the Apoſtles, and all the Church, looked on them as legitimate, had no cauſe to doubt but that a believing huſband might lawfully dwell with a party, that continued obſtinate in infidelity. This is St. Paul's meaning in this place.

Q. Inſtead of applying theſe words, *your children are holy*, to the ſtate of theſe children, and the right their parents had to give them birth, notwithſtanding the incredulity of one or the other, may not one underſtand them of a ſanctity, that gave them ſome title to heaven?

A. This is a ſecond meaning, that likewiſe agrees well with theſe words. I ſay then to clear it up, that this ſanctity of the children, of which St. Paul ſpeaks in this paſſage, was derived to them, not from their birth, but from the baptiſm procured them by their parents, one of whom being a believer, would not fail to give them a Chriſtian education. But the notion, that to be born of believing parents is ſufficient, without baptiſm, to impart ſanctity to children, is not ageeable to St. Paul's deſign, which was to prevent the inconveniencies, that might be cauſed in marriage, by the different religion of the huſband and wife, which might induce the huſbands to ſeparate from their wives, that continued in infidelity, or the believing wives to deſert their huſbands, who adhered to paganiſm. On the other ſide nothing was better adapted to hinder theſe ſeparations, than to ſpeak of the ſanctity, which the believing father or mother procured for their children, by making them receive Baptiſm, and inſtructing them in the Chriſtian Religion. It is with this view St. Paul repreſents to them, that if the believing party ſhould quit the unbelieving party, their children would be unclean, whereas they are ſanctified by their preſence: *Your children*, ſays he, *would be unclean; but now they are holy.*

Q. It is evident, that this explanation is perfectly con-

ſiſtent with St. Paul's deſign, but have you no other proof to ſupport it?

A. I obſerve further, that St. Paul propoſes, in regard of the father and mother, the ſame reaſon, which he propoſes in regard of the children: *How knoweſt thou*, ſays he, *O wife whether thou ſhalt ſave thy huſband? or how knoweſt thou, O man, whether thou ſhalt ſave thy wife?* * We may believe the ſame conſideration made the Apoſtle ſay, *the unbelieving huſband is ſanctified by the believing wife*, &c. St. Peter ſays in like manner, *let wives be ſubject to their huſbands: that if any believe not the word, they may be won without the word, by the converſation of the wives, conſidering your chaſte converſation with fear.* † We are then rightly induced to believe, that St. Paul reaſoned in regard of the children, as he reaſons in regard of the father and mother; that is, he endeavours to engage the believing party, not to quit the unbelieving party, on account of the great utility their preſence may be towards the ſalvation both of the unbeliever, and of the children that may be born of them.

CHAP. II.

Of Confirmation.

Q. IS Confirmation grounded on the word of God?

A. It is related in the eighth chapter of the Acts, that the inhabitants of Samaria received the faith, and that St. Philip baptized them. The Apoſtles being informed of this, did not think it ſufficient that they were baptized, but ſent St. Peter and St. John, to impart to them the Holy Ghoſt, by the impoſition of

* 1 Cor. vii. 16. † 1 Pet. iii. 1, 2.

hands. This is what we call the *Sacrament of Confirmation.*

Q. Continue to relate the paſſages of the New Teſtament, which ſpeak of this Sacrament of the impoſition of hands, or *Confirmation.*

A. It is remarked in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts, that the Apoſtles informed themſelves, as the Biſhops do at preſent, in paſſing through the towns, if there were any, who had not received the Holy Ghoſt, on whom they might lay their hands, or, to ſpeak in the language of theſe times, that had not been confirmed.

Q. Are theſe the only paſſages of the New Teſtament, in which Confirmation is pointed out?

A. It is with relation and alluſion to Confirmation, that it is ſaid in ſeveral parts of the Epiſtles, that the Faithful have received the unction and the ſeal of the Holy Ghoſt. * There is likewiſe in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews, a reference or alluſion to the three Sacraments of Baptiſm, Confirmation, and the Euchariſt, which the firſt Chriſtians uſually received together. For there mention is made of the Faithful, who had been enlightened, had taſted the heavenly gift, and had been made partakers of the Holy Ghoſt. †

Q. Was not this impoſition of hands confined to the time of the Apoſtles, and to end with them?

A. No. For though the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghoſt are not now neceſſary, yet we ſtand in need of thoſe ſalutary gifts, by which the Holy Ghoſt confirms and ſtrengthens the faith and piety of Chriſtians: and theſe were the principal ones conferred on the firſt believers, by the impoſition of hands. It was by the ſalutary gifts received in this Sacrament, that they were confirmed, that they were ſealed for the day of redemption, that they received the unction which taught them all things, that the Kingdom of God was in them

* 2 Cor. i. 21. 22. Epheſ. i. 13. 1 Jo. ii. 20. 27. † Heb. vi. 4.

juſtice and peace; in a word, that *they were transformed into the image of Jeſus Chriſt, from glory to glory.* This it is, which has made the Engliſh Proteſtants ſay, when they give confirmation, that they lay their hands on Chriſtians, according to the example of the Apoſtles, to aſſure them, by that ſign, of God's favor towards them.

Q. Can one gather from any expreſs paſſages of the word of God, that this impoſition of hands was not to end with the times of the Apoſtles?

A. The Holy Ghoſt plainly tells us, that this impoſition of hands belongs to the *foundation of faith;* and he places it in the number of eſſential articles, which all Chriſtians acknowledge are common to all ages of the Church, viz. Penance, Faith, Baptiſm, the Reſurrection and laſt Judgment; *not ſtopping to lay again,* ſays St. Paul, *the foundation of penance from dead works, and of faith towards God, of the doctrine of Baptiſms, and of the impoſition of hands, and of the reſurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment.* *

Q. What inference ſhould we draw from this paſſage?

A. That many of the reformed Churches have retrenched from religion a thing, which the Holy Spirit hath expreſsly declared to belong to the foundation of faith. They inceſſantly accuſe the Church of retrenching ſeveral things from religion. One may confidently challenge them to point out one paſſage, in which the things they aſſert to be retrenched, are expreſsly pronounced fundamental. They allege nothing in proof but their own reaſonings. But it is in an expreſs paſſage of the word of God, that we ſhew them, that confirmation, which they have aboliſhed, is a fundamental article. For St. Paul teaches, that *this impoſition of hands,* which as the French Proteſtants ſay in the notes of their bible on this paſſage, *ſerved to confirm the Chriſtians that had*

* Heb. vi. 2.

been baptiſed in their infancy, when they came of age; St. Paul, I ſay, poſitively teaches that this impoſition of hands belongs to the foundation of faith.

Q. Was it cuſtomary in the time of the Apoſtles, as at preſent, to join the anointing with the impoſition of hands, in the adminiſtration of this ſacrament?

A. It is with reference, very probably to confirmation, and the anointing uſed in it, that St. Paul ſays to the Corinthians: *He that confirmeth us with you, in Chriſt, and he that hath anointed us, is God: Who alſo hath ſealed us, and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts.** This paſſage is convincing on this ſubject; we here find the name of confirmation, *he that confirmeth us*; the anointing uſed, *and he that hath anointed us*; the grace of the ſacrament, *who hath given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts*; the principal effect of this grace, which is to be a ſeal and pledge of eternal glory, *with which he hath ſealed us, and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts.* Thus this paſſage alludes in every word, to the whole doctrine of the Church concerning confirmation.

Q. What does the ſign of the impoſition of hands repreſent here?

A. The grace of the Holy Ghoſt, which deſcends from heaven to repoſe on the ſouls of the faithful, as the hands of the Biſhop reſt on their heads, and the protection of God, who receives the faithful, as it were into his hands, to defend them againſt their enemies.

Q. What does the anointing repreſent?

A. Anointing is applied, in Holy Scripture, for many uſes, in which it may properly repreſent the effect of the grace of the Holy Ghoſt; for example, to heal wounds, to ſpread a ſweet ſavour, to conſecrate things or perſons, as Kings, Prieſts and Prophets; but we may here take notice of two principal ones, viz. that oil was uſed by the Athletic Combatants to ſtrengthen them in their

* 2 Cor. i. 21. 22.

conflicts, and was a ſign of joy. * This ſhews us that the grace of confirmation is a fortifying grace, which prepares us to ſtand againſt our enemies, and that it fills the faithful ſoul with gladneſs, amidſt the ſtruggles of the moſt violent combats.

Q. What Chriſtians are more particularly bound to receive confirmation?

A. They, who have recently received the grace of faith. As the particular grace annexed to this ſacrament is to ſtrengthen faith, they cannot be too ſolicitous in applying for a help ſo neceſſary to them. In effect the Apoſtles no ſooner ſaw any new converts, than they adminiſtered to them this ſacrament of the impoſition of hands. As ſoon as they were apprized of the converſion of the Samaritans by St. Philip, they ſent two to confirm them. And St. Paul, in paſſing through Epheſus, where he found ſome new Chriſtians, appears only anxious to know whether they had laid their hands on them, that they might receive the Holy Spirit. So that they, who have lately received the gift of faith, ought, with a holy earneſtneſs, to have recourſe to confirmation, if they mean to follow the lights of the Holy Scripture.

Q. This was expedient in the beginning of the Church, when perſecutions raged, and when the faithful were expoſed to great temptations; but we are at preſent in different circumſtances.

A. The averſion and contempt of friends and relations, among whom we dwell, is a great temptation. For this reaſon, our Lord ſo frequently admoniſhes Chriſtians of this temptation, by commanding them, under pain of damnation, to love him more than father, mother, brother, ſiſter, children, and friends; † this is a dreadful temptation, to which true converts are now expoſed. They likewiſe frequently have to ſtruggle with their own

---

* Luke x. 34. Gen. xxviii. 18. Exod. xxix. 7. 21. 1 Sam. xvi. 1. 1 Kings xix. 16. Pſ. xliv. 8. † Matt. x. 37. Luke xiv. 26.

imagination, and bent of mind, occaſioned by a long contracted habit, and continuance in error. For this reaſon, theſe people are particularly bound after the example of the firſt Chriſtians, to ſeek for thoſe graces, which God tenders them by the impoſition of the hands of the Biſhop, in order to confirm the faith of his children.

CHAP. III.

Of Penance.

Q. WHAT do we learn in the word of God, concerning Confeſſion?

A. It was commanded in the Old Teſtament: *When any one*, ſays Moſes, *ſhall have committed a ſin, and ſhall have tranſgreſſed the Commandment of the Lord, and offended, he ſhall confeſs his ſin, and do penance for it, and the Prieſt ſhall pray, and make atonement for him on account of his ſin.* *

Q. Is not this a practice of the Old Teſtament, that was aboliſhed in the New?

A. The Goſpel does not any where aboliſh it; beſides, it is as neceſſary as ever. For if it was neceſſary for the Iſraelites to diſcover their ſins to the Prieſts, to learn from them what ſacrifices they ſhould offer for an atonement for them; Chriſtians likewiſe ſtand in need of inſtructions, to be informed of the proper remedies to be applied for the abolition of their ſins. For this reaſon we ſhould look on the knowledge requiſite in the Prieſts of the Old Teſtament, to diſtinguiſh betwixt leper and leper, ſound and unſound, as a figure of the lights neceſſary for the Prieſts of the New Teſtament, to diſtinguiſh the nature of ſin, and to diſcern whether it be

* Num. v 7. Levit. v. 5. 12.

only in the ſkin, and reach not the vital parts; or whether it be like the ſpreading leproſy, and mortally wound the life of the ſoul. *

Q. Are there any expreſs proofs in the Holy Scripture, that confeſſion was practiſed under the New Teſtament, as well as under the Old?

A. We have two witneſſes of it, St. Matthew and St. Mark, who relate of St. John the Baptiſt, who firſt preached the Goſpel, that the Jews were baptized by him in the Jordan, confeſſing their ſins. †

Q. Do we find any examples of the faithful confeſſing their ſins, after baptiſm was thoroughly eſtabliſhed?

A. *Many of them that believed*, ſays St. Luke, *came confeſſing and declaring their deeds.* ‡ We ſee in the ſame paſſage, how the Apoſtles had learned from this confeſſion, that many of them had books of magic, which they obliged them to burn.

Q. Do you ground the neceſſity of confeſſion on all theſe paſſages you have cited?

A. I only quoted them to ſhew the uſefulneſs of confeſſion, and to refute thoſe, who ſay it is not only unprofitable, but likewiſe pernicious. But as to the neceſſity of confeſſion, it is founded on the paſſage, where Jeſus Chriſt eſtabliſhes the ſacrament of penance, *whoſe ſins you ſhall forgive, they are forgiven them: and whoſe ſins you ſhall retain, they are retained.* §

Q. Is there any other paſſage in the New Teſtament, in which mention is made of this confeſſion of ſins, which we ought to make to the Prieſts?

A. It is very apparent, that the command of St. James relates to it, *confeſs your ſins one to another.* ¶

Q. May it not be ſaid, that he ſpeaks here of the confeſſion, which private perſons, on occaſion of any difference, make one to the other, becauſe in ſaying,

---

* Lev. x. 10. & xiv. † Matt. iii. 6. Mark i. 5. ‡ Acts xix. 18.
§ John xx. 23. ¶ Jam. v. 16.

confeſs your ſins to one another, St. James ſhews he is to be underſtood of reciprocal confeſſion. Now prieſts confeſs not their ſins to laymen, as they do to them.

A. The prieſts, to whom the people confeſs their ſins, likewiſe confeſs theirs to the other Prieſts. Beſides, theſe words, *to one another*, do not always indicate a mutual action between the ſame perſons: for example, when the Apoſtles exhort Chriſtians *to be hoſpitable and charitable one towards another*, they do not mean the poor ſhould entertain the rich, as the rich ſhould the poor. *

Q. Why do you underſtand this paſſage of confeſſion to Prieſts?

A. Not only on account of the command of Jeſus Chriſt, who eſtabliſhed the ſacrament of penance in the Church, but alſo I obſerve particularly in this paſſage of St. James, that the preceding verſe ſpeaks of Prieſts, whom the ſick perſon had ſent for, in order to be relieved, and to obtain the remiſſion of his ſins. We ſhould then be induced to believe, that not only the anointing, but alſo the prayer and confeſſion here mentioned are things, that belong to their miniſtry.

Q. Many profeſſors of the Proteſtant Religion, make no difficulty of approving confeſſion; but it appears moſt ſtrange to them for Prieſts, who are ſinners, to pretend to abſolve men from their ſins.

A. The ſame paſſage that moſt ſtrictly enjoins the obligation of confeſſing, moſt undeniably eſtabliſhes the right of Prieſts to abſolve; *whoſe ſins you ſhall forgive, they are forgiven them: and whoſe ſins you ſhall retain, they are retained.* † And in the Goſpel of St. Matthew, it is ſaid: *whatever you ſhall bind upon earth, ſhall be bound alſo in heaven: and whatever you ſhall looſe upon earth, ſhall be looſed alſo in heaven.* ‡

Q. Was not this power a particular privilege of the Apoſtles?

---

* 1 Pet. iv. 9. Eph. iv. 23. v. 21. † John xx. 23. ‡ Matt. xviii. 18.

A. If the Apoſtles had it, they are clearly in an error, who ſay it is impoſſible that man can abſolve others from their ſins. But by what law is this power reſtrained to the perſons of the Apoſtles? Is it becauſe this is ſpoken only to them? Muſt we infer from thence, that the Apoſtles only were commiſſioned to labor in the converſion of Infidels, and to adminiſter Baptiſm? Chriſtianity, at that rate, would ſhortly be at an end. The concluſion then neceſſarily follows, that Prieſts, who have inherited from the Apoſtles the right of preaching and baptizing, have likewiſe inherited that of abſolving from ſin; ſince all theſe powers are not leſs neceſſary in later ages, than in the beginning of the Church.

Q. Yet our Lord approves of the doctrine of the Jews, who ſaid, *who can forgive ſins, but God alone.?* *

A. We muſt believe that God alone forgives ſins, and that his Miniſters can likewiſe forgive them, becauſe we find both theſe things in the Holy Scripture.

Q. How muſt we reconcile theſe two truths?

A. Eaſily. God forgives ſins in his own name, and by his own authority, becauſe he is the only ſovereign Monarch, the only one, ſtrictly ſpeaking, offended, and the ſole maſter of Heaven and Hell. But men can forgive in the name of God, commiſſioned by him, on his part, and by his authority. Thus, when prieſts forgive ſins, they are ſervants, by whoſe miniſtry God forgives. For which reaſon their abſolution is only efficacious to thoſe, who receive it with the diſpoſitions of true repentance.

Q. Is there no paſſage in the Holy Scripture to convince us that there is no abſurdity in ſaying, that men may confer on the part of God, the remiſſion of ſins to others, who frequently are better men than themſelves?

A. There are as many, as there are paſſages on the ſacraments, which repreſent them as ſeals of the forgiveneſs

* Luke v. 21.

of ſins. When our Lord inſtituted baptiſm for the remiſſion of ſins, did he not mean to give power to men that were ſinners, to confer in his name the forgiveneſs of ſins on children, and others, that might receive baptiſm? When the Apoſtles ordained that prieſts ſhould pray for the ſick, and anoint them with oil in the name of the Lord, promiſing them the forgiveneſs of their ſins, did they not intend that ſinners ſhould confer in the name of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the remiſſion of ſins on others, ſometimes leſs involved in guilt than themſelves? *

Q. What concluſion do you draw from this?

A. That their veneration is not high for the word of God, who cannot bear to hear it ſaid, that the Miniſters of Jeſus Chriſt confer the pardon of ſins, and who have a particular abhorrence to the aſcribing ſuch power to them in the ſacrament of penance, concerning which our Lord hath ſaid in expreſs terms, *whoſe ſins you ſhall forgive they are forgiven them.*

Q. Are ſinners, that have confeſſed their ſins, bound to perform the penances enjoined by their confeſſors?

A. Yes. For the ſpirit prevalent in the Holy Scripture, is a ſpirit of penance. *Do penance.* It was the common ſubject of the Prophets, of St. John, of our Lord, and of his Apoſtles. †

Q. Does this penance imply any mortification of the body, beſides the renunciation of ſin, and the practice of good works?

A. The Holy Scripture always explains it in this manner. When the Ninivites reſolved to do penance, they did not only ſay, *let every one turn from his ſin*, but likewiſe, *let every one put on ſackcloth, and faſt and refrain even from drinking water.* ‡ The Holy Ghoſt commends Achab, becauſe, after he heard the threats of God denounced by the mouth of Elias, he ſubjected himſelf

---

* Jam. v. 14. 15. Apoc. ii. 5.

† Jer. xviii. 8. Ezech. xviii. 30. Matt. iii. 2. 3.

‡ Jon. iii. 7.

to the mortifications of penance; *he rent his garments, and put haircloth upon his fleſh, and faſted and ſlept in ſackcloth, and walked with his head caſt down.** This is the life of penance which Judith embraced in her widowhood, as it is recorded, *that ſhe made herſelf a private chamber in the upper part of her houſe, in which ſhe abode ſhut up with her maids, and ſhe wore haircloth upon her loins, and faſted all the days of her life, except the feaſts of the houſe of Iſrael.* †

Q. Are the mortifications of penance likewiſe propoſed with commendations in the New Teſtament?

A. Undoubtedly; as appears in the example given by St. John, when he preached penance. To enforce it by example, he remained in the deſert cloathed with a coarſe garment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins, and his meat was locuſts and wild honey. ‡ When our Lord mentions the circumſtances of chriſtian penance, he joins faſting and prayer. § The Apoſtles frequently recommended faſting. ¶ When St. Paul encourages, by his own example, all that wiſh to gain the prize of an incorruptible crown, he tells them, he chaſtiſes his body, and brings it into ſubjection. ‖ This holy deſign induced St. Timothy to refrain from wine, till the weakneſs of his ſtomach, and St. Paul's authority, prevailed on him to mitigate the rigour of his mortifications. **

Q. What are the uſes and advantages of penance pointed out in the Holy Scripture?

A. The firſt relates to the paſt, and cauſes us to appeaſe the wrath of God irritated by ſin; and for this end to revenge ourſelves upon ourſelves. *Who can tell*, ſay the inhabitants of Ninive, aſſigning the motive for their penance, *Who can tell if God will turn and forgive:*

---

* 1 Kings xxi. 27. † Judith viii 5. 6. ‡ Matt. iii. 4.
§ Matt. xvii. 20. ¶ 2 Cor. xi. 7. ‖ 1 Cor. ix. 27.
** 1 Tim. v. 23.

and will turn away from his fierce anger, and we ſhall not periſh. * St. Paul writes to the Corinthians, *that ſorrow, according to God, worketh penance; and that the ſorrow they experienced, had wrought in them, carefulneſs, zeal, and revenge.* † This is that holy revenge, which excites in us a fervent zeal for the glory of God, and cauſes us to take revenge on ourſelves, for our rebellion againſt this glory of our God.

Q. What do you infer from thence?

A. That we cannot doubt, but the Holy Scripture directs ſinners to do penance for the expiation of paſſed ſins; or to ſay the ſame thing in other words, to apply to themſelves the expiation, which our Lord has made for them, by means of voluntary ſufferings, ſuch as the Spirit of God has pointed out in his word.

Q. What is the other intent of penance?

A. It relates to our future conduct. For the Holy Scripture informs us, that it is deſigned to correct the paſſions of the ſinner, that he return no more to his diſorders. This is the uſe and intent explained by the Holy Spirit, in regard of that noted penance, impoſed on the inceſtuous man, which is recorded, that it may be a rule and foundation to all others. *Let him be delivered to Satan,* ſays St. Paul, *for the deſtruction of the fleſh, that the Spirit may be ſaved in the day of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* ‡

Q. Does the word of God allow the Church ſometimes to remit to ſinners the puniſhments, which they are bound to undergo, on account of their ſins?

A. This is a part of the power, with which Jeſus Chriſt intruſted it, when he ſaid, *Whatſoever you ſhall looſe upon earth, ſhall be looſed alſo in heaven. Whoſe ſins you ſhall forgive, they are forgiven them.* And the relaxation, which the Church grants by virtue of this power, of the

---

* Jon. iii. 9. † 2 Cor. vii. 11. ‡ 1 Cor. v. 4. 5.

puniſhments, which ſinners were under an obligation of ſubmiting to, is called, *Indulgence.*

Q. Is there any inſtance of an indulgence in the New Teſtament?

A. St. Paul having heard of the repentance of the inceſtuous Corinthian, pardoned him, and releaſed him from the puniſhment he had impoſed on him, leſt, as he ſays, *he might be over-reached by Satan, and ſwallowed up with over much ſorrow.* *

Q. What do you conclude from this example?

A. I infer from it, that when the Church perceives, that the penances ſhe has laid on ſinners, have produced a ſalutary effect, ſhe can remit them. I likewiſe infer, that indulgences are only profitable to thoſe, who, like this ſinner of Corinth, truly repent of their crimes, have entered upon a ſincere penance, and cannot continue in it without expoſing themſelves to great inconveniences.

CHAP. IV.

Of Extreme Unction.

IS the Sacrament of Extreme Unction eſtabliſhed in the New Teſtament?

A. St. James ſays in expreſs terms, *Is any man ſick among you? Let him bring in the prieſts of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: And the prayer of faith ſhall ſave the ſick man; and the Lord ſhall raiſe him up; and if he be in ſins, they ſhall be forgiven him.* † We have here in this ſingle paſſage a ſacred ſign, which is the anointing joined with prayer, and the grace peculiar to the ſacra-

* 2 Cor. ii. 6. 7. 11. † Jam. v. 14. 15.

ment, which is the health of the body, when it is for the glory of God, and above all, the remiſſion of ſins.

Q. Should Extreme Unction have been aboliſhed, when the gift of miraculous cures was obſerved to ceaſe in the Church?

A. Though faith be not now accompanied with the gift of miracles, as among the firſt Chriſtians,* it is not leſs neceſſary now; the ſame is to be ſaid of this ſacred Unction of the ſick.

Q. Should we, in this regard, reaſon about the ſacraments, as we do concerning faith?

A. Yes, for though we do not any longer receive in the ſacraments the miraculous gifts, together with grace, yet they are no leſs neceſſary.

Q. Mention an example.

A. Only the firſt Chriſtians received at the ſame time the ordinary and extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghoſt in confirmation. Yet the Church continued it, that all might receive the ordinary graces, which are the principal effect of it, and St. Paul has placed it in the number of thoſe things, that are to remain till the end of the world.†

Q. Produce ſome example on this ſubject, that is unconteſted by Proteſtants.

A. The hiſtory of the Church ſpeaks of miraculous cures wrought by baptiſm. But to confine ourſelves to the word of God, St. Paul informs us, that many unworthy communions were puniſhed with infirmities and death.‡ Yet, although theſe miracles appear not now in the participation of the Euchariſt, it is not laid aſide on that account.

Q. What concluſion do you draw from thence?

A. That though the gift of curing the ſick ſhould have ceaſed in the Church, this ought not to hinder the application of the ſacred unction to the infirm, in order

---

* Mark xvi. 17, 18. John xiv. 12. † Heb. vi. 12. ‡ 1 Cor. xi. 30.

to draw down the ſalutary graces annexed to it, and, above all, the remiſſion of ſins, which the faithful will always ſtand in need of, and of which, as St. James teaches, it is the ſeal.

Q. Is this Unction no longer of any uſe for the health of the body?

A. Though God does not ſo frequently think proper to heal the ſick, who receive this ſacrament, as he did in the primitive Church, he ſtill continues mercifully to hear the prayers, that are offered to him for the health of the ſick, when this favor conduces to the honor of God and their ſalvation; a caſe which occaſionally takes place.

Q. If this Unction is reſtorative of the health of the body, why do not the ſick receive it till the illneſs appear deſperate?

A. If it had been uſual in the Church, even in the time of the Apoſtles, not to receive Extreme Unction, till death was certainly at hand, we might have ſuppoſed that the Holy Scripture did not teach us to aſk for it till all ordinary means are thought inſufficient. One might ſay, for example, that St. Paul did not adviſe Timothy to cure the weakneſs in his ſtomach by this ſacred Unction, ſince he commands him to take a little wine.* But as this cuſtom of receiving this ſacred Unction ſo late, was only introduced into the Church on account of the weakneſs of men, who are terrified at the thoughts of preparing for death; we may ſay with more reaſon, that it is the fault of the ſick, if they receive not this ſacred Unction till the illneſs appear deſperate. The Church does not command them to defer till this extremity; as ſoon as the illneſs is dangerous they may call for the Sacrament of this ſacred anointing, of which St. James ſpeaks.

---

* 1 Tim. v. 23.

CHAP. V.

Of Order.

Q. IS the Sacrament of Order eſtabliſhed in the word of God?

A. Yes. For we there ſee a ſacred ſign, which is the impoſition of hands, and grace joined with this ſign. *Neglect not*, ſays St. Paul to Timothy, *the grace that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the impoſition of the hands of the prieſthood.** *I admoniſh thee*, ſays he to him again, *that thou ſtir up the grace of God, which is in thee by the impoſition of my hands.*†

Q. Do we find in the Holy Scripture, that there were to be Biſhops among the Miniſters of the Church?

A. The word of God repreſents Biſhops as eſtabliſhed to ordain Prieſts, and as having juriſdiction over them. They are the Biſhops, that are ſtiled, in the New Teſtament, *the Angels of the Church*. For we learn, in the Acts, that in thoſe primitive times there were ſeveral Miniſters at Epheſus; yet among theſe Miniſters of Epheſus, there is only one, whom Jeſus Chriſt calls in particular, in the Apocalypſe, *The Angel of the Church of Epheſus*.

Q. Does the New Teſtament mention the names of any Biſhops, whom the Apoſtles had appointed to ordain Prieſts, and to have juriſdiction over them?

A. It names, among others, St. Timothy, whom St. Paul had eſtabliſhed at Epheſus, and St. Titus, whom he had eſtabliſhed in Crete.

Q. Quote ſome paſſage, that indicates this ſuperiority of St. Timothy over the other Prieſts.

---

* 1 Tim. iv 14. † 2 Tim. i. 6. As the Engliſh Reformers did not conſider *order* as a ſacrament, they found it neceſſary to change the word *grace*, in theſe paſſages, into *gift*. In like manner they have changed *Prieſt* into *Elder*, in the following quotations.

A. St. Paul having deſcribed the qualities requiſite in thoſe perſons, to whom he ſhould intruſt the ſacred Miniſtry, and the duties it was incumbent on him to diſcharge, ſays to him; *Againſt a Prieſt receive not an accuſation, but under two or three witneſſes.* *

Q. Mention likewiſe ſome paſſage, that ſhews St. Titus's ſuperiority over other Prieſts.

A. St. Paul begins the letter he wrote to him, by ſaying: *I left thee in Crete, that thou ſhouldſt ſet in order the things that are wanting, and ſhouldſt ordain Prieſts in every city;* † and afterwards, the remaining part of his Epiſtle is filled with inſtructions concerning the different duties of his Epiſcopacy. And that he might more thoroughly underſtand in what manner to acquit himſelf of it, he repreſents to him the qualities they were to poſſeſs, who ſhould be admitted to the holy miniſtry.

Q. What are the lawful ways, by which a perſon may be admitted among the Prieſts and Levites of the Church?

A. The Holy Scripture only points out two; viz. an ordinary miſſion, and an extraordinary one.

Q. What do you underſtand by an ordinary miſſion?

A. Under the Old Teſtament, it was to be deſcended from ſome family of the Sacrificers, or Levites: and under the New, to have received the impoſition of the hands of a Biſhop. Thus St. Paul recommends to St. Timothy, Biſhop of Epheſus, and to St. Titus, Biſhop of Crete, to ordain Prieſts in the Churches? ‡

Q. What do you underſtand by an extraordinary miſſion?

A. That which is proved by miracles, by which God makes it manifeſt to thoſe, who have not an ordinary miſſion, that he has eſtabliſhed them to be Miniſters in his Church; ſuch, for example, was the miſſion of Moſes, and that of the Prophets.

---

* Tim. v. 19. † Tit. i. 5. ‡ Ibid, and 1 Tim. v. 22.

Q. Can no one, without either of theſe miſſions, exerciſe the ſacred miniſtry in the Church?

A. Not without a ſacrilegious uſurpation of God's authority. The Holy Ghoſt ſays, *No man takes the honor to himſelf, but he that is called by God.* * We do not find in all the Holy Scripture any vocation, that was not legalized by one of theſe ways, viz. by birth in the Old Teſtament, and by the ordination of Biſhops in the New; or in default of this ordinary way, by miracles wrought expreſsly for that purpoſe. A third kind of vocation has no foundation in the Holy Scriptures.

Q. Is not a vocation, that neither is authorized in the ordinary way, nor extraordinary way, that you have pointed out, expreſsly condemned in the word of God?

A. Yes; for one of the principal things, with which the Holy Scripture reproaches the Schiſmatics of the ten tribes, is that they had prieſts to offer ſacrifice without a miſſion. *Jeroboam*, ſays the word of God, *made Prieſts of the meaneſt of the people that were not the children of Levi.* †

Q. May we not, in caſe of neceſſity, eſtabliſh miniſters, though they be not called either by the ordinary way, or the extraordinary which is made known to us by miracles?

A. This pretended neceſſity was likewiſe the pretext Saul alledged, in excuſe for his raſhneſs, in preſuming to offer ſacrifice when the Philiſtines were aſſembled to attack him. *I ſaw that the people ſlipt from me*, ſays he to Samuel, *and thou waſt not come according to the days appointed, and the Philiſtines were gathered together to fight, and I had not appeaſed the face of the Lord: forced by neceſſity, I offered the holocauſt.* ‡ The Prophet Samuel condemned this excuſe, and anſwered him on the part of God: *Thou haſt done fooliſhly, and haſt not kept the com-*

---

* Heb. v. 4. † 1 Kings xiii. 13, 2. Chron. xi. 15, xiii. 9.
‡ 1 Sam. xiii. 11, 12.

mandments of the Lord thy God; and thy kingdom ſhall not continue. * When there is a real neceſſity to eſtabliſh miniſters by an extraordinary way, as in the time of Moſes and the Apoſtles, God ſhews his will by working miracles; and when he does not work them to eſtabliſh miniſters in this extraordinary way, it is a certain ſign his will is, that we ſhould be content with thoſe, that have been called by ſucceſſion, which is the ordinary way.

Q. What do you conclude from this truth againſt the followers of the reformed churches?

A. That the reformers, whom the people ordained, as Riviere of Paris, and Le Clerc, wool-dreſſer of Meaux, were men without vocation. I likewiſe conclude, that this defect of vocation is found in almoſt all the miniſters of the Proteſtant Religion. As they were not ordained by Biſhops, they have no right to preach, nor to adminiſter the Sacraments. None of them entered by the door; hence, according to the Goſpel, they cannot be looked on as true Shepherds, † and that ought to be applied to them which God ſaid by Jeremy. *I have not ſent theſe Prophets, yet they ran: I have not ſpoken to them, yet they propheſied.* ‡

CHAP. VI.

Of Matrimony.

Q. WHAT do you believe concerning Matrimony?

A. I believe it to be a Sacrament; the union of the huſband and wife being the viſible ſign of the inviſible grace, which is repreſented to us by marriage. For St. Paul ſpeaks of it as a ſign of the union, that ſubſiſts be-

* Ibid. 13. † John x. 1. ‡ Jer. xxiii. 21.

twixt Jeſus Chriſt and his Church. * Grace is likewiſe conferred in Matrimony, ſince they, who receive it in proper diſpoſitions, find therein the grace neceſſary to live with ſanctity in holy Matrimony.

Q. In what does the union of the chriſtian huſband, with the chriſtian wife, repreſent the union of Jeſus Chriſt with his Church?

A. In this, that Jeſus Chriſt can never forſake his Church, as a huſband can never quit his wife; and that he communicates his goods to his Church, viz. his goods of grace and glory, as a huſband makes his wife partaker of his poſſeſſions. For which reaſon, the Reformers have violated the ſanctity of the marriage of Jeſus Chriſt with his Church, by ſuppoſing that he had abandoned it, and that for many ages he had not imparted to it his Spirit of purity and truth.

Q. Have you any paſſage of the New Teſtament on this ſubject?

A. St. Paul ſtyles Matrimony *a great myſtery*, † which the Vulgate has tranſlated *a great Sacrament*. In reality, the term myſtery is the moſt common name, which the Church has always given to the Sacraments. We ought likewiſe to obſerve, that the Holy Spirit, foreſeeing the oppoſition of Noveliſts on this ſubject, hath given to Matrimony the name of Myſtery, or Sacrament, which he does not give even to Baptiſm, or to the Euchariſt. There are, in like manner, other precautions to be found reſpecting the other Sacraments, that were to be moſt called in queſtion, that they, who truly and ſincerely ſubmit to the direction of the Holy Scripture, may not be ſeduced by the illuſions of innovators, on the ſubject of the Sacraments.

Q. Though Matrimony be ſo holy a ſtate, does this prevent one from gathering from the word of God, that celibacy is an excellent thing?

---

* Eph. v. 23. † Ibid. 32.

A. Jeſus Chriſt expreſsly teaches, *that there are ſome who have embraced this ſtate for the kingdom of heaven,* * though it be not a gift granted to every one. St. Paul who was unmarried, ſays, *he wiſhes all Chriſtians were in a ſtate like his, that they might ſerve our Lord without ſolicitude.* †

Q. Does not this lead to ſome reflections againſt the Proteſtant Reformers?

A. It is moſt aſtoniſhing, that not one of the Reformers ever embraced a ſtate ſo holy, and ſo much recommended in the Holy Scripture. They themſelves acknowledge this to have been the ſtate, in which the ancient Fathers generally ſpent their lives, who did not, like them, pretend to have been extraordinarily raiſed up by God, to reclaim his Church; inſtead of which all the Reformers, whether free or bound by vows to the contrary, entered into the ſtate of Matrimony.

Q. Does not St. Paul allow all Chriſtians to marry, when he ſays, *For fear of fornication, let every man have his own wife?* ‡

A. The Apoſtle ſpeaks, in this paſſage, only to thoſe that are married, that they may not ſeparate from their wives; or to thoſe, who, being unmarried, have not deprived themſelves of the right of entering into that ſtate. For when ſome women, in his time, who had devoted themſelves to the Church, wanted to aſſuage the motions of their concupiſcence by marriage, ſo far from commending them, he reprimands them for their infidelity. *The younger widows,* ſays he, *avoid, for when they have grown wanton in Chriſt, they will marry: having damnation, becauſe they have made void their firſt faith.* § Marriage then, according to St. Paul, is not a lawful remedy againſt concupiſcence for thoſe, who by a voluntary engagement have excluded themſelves from

---

* Matt. xix. 12 † 1 Cor. vii. 7. 35. ‡ Ibid. 2.
§ 1 Tim. v. 11. 12.

it. When tempted on theſe occaſions, they ſhould look on their ſtate to be ſimilar to that of a wife, that is ſeparated from her huſband by long abſence, by impriſonment, or ſome inveterate diſorder; they ought then to have recourſe to faſting, prayer and laborious exerciſes, and fly all dangerous occaſions.

Q. The Apoſtle ſays in general, that *marriage is honorable in all.* *

A. Many are of opinion it ſhould be tranſlated *in all things*, and not *in all perſons*, and that St. Paul in this paſſage intended to condemn certain Heretics, who condemned the generation of children as evil. But if it be *in all, or betwixt all perſons*, the ſenſe of this ſentence muſt notwithſtanding be reſtrained to thoſe, who have a right to marry; for if you take it in a ſtrict literal ſenſe, it would follow, that marriage would be honorable betwixt brothers and ſiſters.

Q. Have you no other lights to clear up this paſſage?

A. All the following parts of the diſcourſe ſhew it ſhould be tranſlated, not *marriage is honorable among all*, as if St. Paul meant to overthrow the opinion of ſome, that ſaid there were perſons among whom marriage was not honorable; but that marriage ſhould be honorable in all things: for the Apoſtle here exhorts all, that were married, not to defile the ſanctity of their ſtate by adultery.

Q. How do you ſupport this explication?

A. This paſſage is exhortative, not doctrinal. The three preceding and the three ſubſequent verſes, are exhortations to morality. Why then ſhould we make St. Paul introduce a verſe of inſtruction in the middle, and teach that all have permiſſion to marry. This then is rather an exhortation to all married people to behave with modeſty; an exhortation which is obvious from the verſe itſelf, *let marriage be honorable in all, and the*

* Heb. xiii. 4.

bed undefiled. The laſt part is explanatory of the firſt; *for*, adds the Apoſtle, *fornicators and adulterers God will judge.* * This is an evident proof, ſhewing the obligation all married people lie under, of not defiling the bed by adultery; for the word fornicator is frequently applied, in the Holy Scripture, to all kinds of impurity in general, and not to the crime of the unmarried only.

Q. St. Paul has not only uſed general propoſitions, that ſeem to allow marriage to all perſons, but has expreſsly allowed it to thoſe in particular, whom the Catholic Church forbids to marry: *It behoveth a Biſhop*, ſays he, *to be blameleſs, the huſband of one wife, ſober, &c.* †

A. As the time is not expreſſed in the original, we may interpret it either of the paſt or preſent; we muſt determine it by the lights we find in the Holy Scripture: from whence we learn to underſtand it, not of one, who is, *but who hath been the huſband of one wife.* The Apoſtle not being willing that they who ought to be an example to others, ſhould be marked with the ſigns of incontinence and adheſion to the things of the fleſh, which a ſecond marriage carries with it.

Q. What are the proofs taken from the Holy Scripture, that induce you rather to tranſlate *who hath been*, than *who is the huſband of one wife?*

A. There are two in the ſame verſe.

Q. Which is the firſt proof?

A. If St. Paul intended to teach in this place, that Biſhops were not bound to celibacy, he would have ſaid *it behoveth a Biſhop to be blameleſs, married, ſober, &c.* He would not have added, *married to one wife.*

Q. Which is the ſecond proof from this verſe?

A. It appears when we conſider the other qualities St. Paul requires in a Biſhop, that he ſpeaks here of neceſſary qualifications, one of which cannot be that he ſhould be married.

---

* Ibid. † 1 Tim. iii. 2.

Q. Shew how theſe two reflections ſtrengthen your explanation, at the ſame time that they deſtroy that of Proteſtants.

A. As it was St. Paul's intention to exclude from the eccleſiaſtical miniſtry ſuch as had had two wives, it behoved him to ſay not only who hath been married, but *who hath been married to one wife only.* Beſides as all the Jews and Gentiles married very young, the Church could not at that time find a ſupply of miniſters, that had not been married; ſo that to have been the huſband of one wife only was then a quality ordinarily as neceſſary in Biſhops, *as to be ſober or blameleſs.*

Q. Have you any other reaſon for this tranſlation, *who hath been the huſband of one wife?*

A. There is one, that carries with it the weight of demonſtration in a part of the ſame epiſtle, where St. Paul regulates the qualifications neceſſary in Deaconeſſes. There is nothing ambiguous in the Greek, as in the paſſage that relates to the Biſhops. The paſt time is there clearly expreſſed; *let her be one*, ſays St. Paul, *who hath been the wife of one huſband.** Now it is manifeſt that the Apoſtle did not require leſs of Biſhops, who hold the firſt rank, and perform the moſt holy functions in the Church, than of women, who were placed in the loweſt, and were employed in the leaſt ſacred of its offices.

Q. It ſeems, at leaſt, that one cannot deny that Deacons were married in the Apoſtle's time. For St. Paul having laid down directions for them in the eighth verſe, adds in the eleventh, *Their wives in like manner chaſte.*†

A. This is a very weak proof that Deacons did not embrace continence in the time of the Apoſtles. For though it were certain that ſome Deacons were choſen at that time, who actually had wives, this does not

---

* 1 Tim. v. 9. † 1 Tim. iii. 8. 11.

ſhew that theſe perſons did not reſolve on a ſtate of perfect continence, on conſecrating themſelves to the miniſtry of the Church, as we ſee in numberleſs examples in the following ages.

Q. Why do you ſay, though it were certain they had then choſen thoſe for Deacons, that were married at the time? Is not this expreſsly aſſerted in the paſſage?

A. This is only expreſsly aſſerted in the Proteſtant verſion, which is corrupted in this place; for the original has only *the women*, and not *their wives*, as it is in the Engliſh Proteſtant tranſlation.

Q. What women does St. Paul ſpeak of in this paſſage?

A. Of women conſecrated to the ſervice of the Church called Deaconeſſes. This is gathered from what precedes, from what follows, and from the verſe itſelf. In the preceding we ſee St. Paul's deſign is to delineate the obligations of all perſons devoted to the ſervice of the Church. In the following we behold him very ſolicitous to point out the duties of women, that ſerved the Church; and the more earneſtly as ſome of them had cauſed great ſcandals. In the verſe itſelf, St. Paul requires, that theſe women ſhould be faithful in all things. Now this fidelity was one of the principal virtues expected in theſe Deaconeſſes, becauſe they held intruſted to their care many things neceſſary for the uſe of the Church, and the relief of the poor.

Q. Yet St. Paul does not ſeem to favor celibacy, in his inſtructions concerning theſe Deaconeſſes, for in prohibiting the admiſſion of women to this rank that were under ſixty, he ſufficiently ſhews, that continence is not a ſtate one can lawfully chooſe.

A. The Apoſtle did not by that intend to ſhew the abſolute unlawfulneſs of engaging in the ſtate of continence before that age; he only points out that it was proper not to receive young perſons as Deaconeſſes, that they might not be expoſed to the occaſions of ſcandal

among perſons raiſed ſo high in the Church, and which would be ſo publicly known by all, whenever they ſhould fly from the engagements of their conſecration. This is not then a deciſion propoſed to all Chriſtians for the regulation of their conduct in regard of vows of celibacy; but it is a precaution ſuggeſted to conductors to direct them in the choice of perſons elevated to an eminent rank in the Church. St. Paul does not mean to hinder all perſons under ſixty from engaging in a ſtate of continence; but his intention is to warn paſtors againſt the elevation of ſuch to employments in the Church, whoſe inconſtancy may occaſion ſcandal.

Q. Continue your reflections on this ſubject.

A. I add that the precaution given by St. Paul, of not admitting women to the rank of Deaconeſſes under ſixty, relates only to the times and places where St. Timothy was; it was ſeen by experience that the temperament of theſe Orientals was too violent to embrace continence, and this particularly for perſons, that remained in the world to attend to the neceſſities of others, and at a time when there was not the example of numberleſs others to refer to, who had either lived in inviolable chaſtity, or were then practiſing that virtue. For which reaſon St. Paul judged it prudent to eſtabliſh in the Churches of Aſia, the rule of not admitting young women to the ſacred engagement of Deaconeſſes. This does not extend to perſons, who in this regard are more ſtrengthened than thoſe new converts in Aſia; perſons who have alienated themſelves from temptations by retreating from the world, and whoſe courage and reſolution are confirmed by the examples of aſtoniſhing multitudes of Chriſtians of all ages and ſexes, who have lived with unblemiſhed purity. But we muſt alſo obſerve that this vow of chaſtity appears ſo lawful to St. Paul, that when it hath been made even by young perſons, that have raſhly engaged themſelves in it, he declares the violation of it a damnable crime. *When they have*, ſays he,

grown wanton in Chriſt, they will marry: having damnation, becauſe they have made void their firſt faith. *

Q. Was the danger of incontinence the only cauſe, why St. Paul eſtabliſhed in Aſia this diſcipline, of refuſing to admit any to be Deaconeſſes but ſuch as were ſixty years of age?

A. Idleneſs and ſloth, into which ſeveral of theſe young women had lapſed, was another cauſe. St. Paul's aim is the remedy of this abuſe; for which reaſon he gives orders that none of thoſe, who were maintained by the alms of the Church, ſhould be received into the number of widows, but ſuch women as were too aged to undergo the fatigue of laborious employments. This place then is only to be underſtood of a particular point of diſcipline, reſpecting the time and parts in which St. Timothy was Biſhop, and cannot be made a rule for other times and places, where the circumſtances and wants are different.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Ceremonies of the Church.

Q. BESIDES the ſacred Ceremonies ordained by God to be Sacraments, can the Church uſe any other ceremonies in the divine ſervice?

A. The Holy Scripture informs us, that God had, in ancient times, eſtabliſhed many.

Q. This was in the Old Teſtament, where they were deſigned to prefigure the myſteries of the Goſpel. But the truth having appeared, the figures have ceaſed.

A. It was not the law of Moſes only, that eſtabliſhed ceremonies of religion; we ſee ſome that were obſerved under the law of nature. Jacob, for example, anointed

* 1 Tim. v. 11, 12.

with oil the ſacred monuments he erected in honor of God,* and laid his hands upon Joſeph's children, to bleſs them.† Ceremonies were not then deſigned for the Jews only, who regulated themſelves by the law of Moſes.

Q. Did our Lord teach nothing concerning the practice of ceremonies, with reference to the time of the New Teſtament?

A. The Goſpel ſhews us, that he would not entirely abrogate the uſe of them. He proſtrated himſelf in prayer, in the garden, before his paſſion.‡ He ſpat on the ground, and made clay of the ſpittle, when he opened the eyes of the man born blind.§ He frequently laid his hands on thoſe, whom he healed by his miracles.‖ The Apoſtles anointed with oil the ſick, whom they intended to cure. Our Lord commanded them to ſhake the duſt off their feet,¶ he breathed on them, when he gave them his Spirit,** and he lifted up his hands to bleſs them at his aſcenſion.††

Q. Does it appear, from any other part of our Lord's conduct, that he authorized the uſe of ceremonies?

A. He has likewiſe ſhewn, that theſe ceremonies, which are no more than pictures, in which the myſteries of religion are viſibly repreſented, are not contrary to the ſpirit of the goſpel, by propoſing his truths hidden under the veil of parables, or under that of different myſterious actions. Such were, for inſtance, the barrenneſs of the fig-tree, curſed for its infertility; and the fiſhes multiplied by his bleſſing.‡‡ Theſe are images, that repreſented to the eyes, or at leaſt to the imagination, the myſteries of Chriſtianity. Beſides, if myſteries, repreſented in ceremonies, had been oppoſite to the ſpirit

---

* Gen. xxviii. 18, xxxv. 14. † Gen. xlviii. 14.
‡ Matt. xxvi. 39. § John ix. 6, 11.
‖ Matt. ix. 18, Mark vii. 32, 33, viii. 23, 25.
¶ Luke ix. 5. ** John xx. 22. †† Luke xxiv. 50.
‡‡ Mark xi. 14, Luke v. 6. John xxi. 6.

of chriſtianity, our Lord would not have inſtituted the ſacraments.

Q. Have the Apoſtles likewiſe approved of the uſe of ceremonies?

A. St. Paul laid himſelf upon the young man before he raiſed him to life; * the impoſition of hands was a common ceremony they uſed, in regard of thoſe, on whom they intended to work any miracles; † they exhorted Chriſtians to lift up their hands to heaven in their prayers. ‡ The univerſal practice of the Church, in regard of ceremonies, ſome of which, as the ſign of the croſs, are met with in all places, leaves no room to doubt, but that the Apoſtles, who founded all the Churches, eſtabliſhed ſome of them.

Q. Why did not all ceremonies ceaſe with the Old Teſtament?

A. Becauſe they were not all deſigned to repreſent the goſpel myſteries, but ſeveral of them were uſeful for thoſe purpoſes, to which they are applied in the chriſtian Church.

Q. What are theſe purpoſes?

A. To inſpire a profound reverence for the Majeſty of God. It is on this account, God ſubjoins as a reaſon to the command, by which he eſtabliſhed ſeveral of them, *for I am holy;* that is to ſay, I do not only abhor ſin, but moreover, I am infinitely exalted above all creatures. §

Q. What are the other uſes of the ceremonies of the Old Teſtament, that are applicable to the new?

A. They helped to raiſe and fix the attention of the people on things belonging to religion. God had ordained them to excite this attention; for theſe viſible objects are well adapted to ſtir up, in the ſoul of man, the remembrance of the holy things they repreſent. He had likewiſe eſtabliſhed them, to keep up the attention

---

* Acts xx. 10. † Acts viii. 16, 17, ix. 17, xix. 6, xxviii. 8.
‡ 1 Tim. ii. 8. § Lev. xxi. 8.

of the Iſraelites; becauſe man is generally ſo weak, that unleſs the mind be quickened, by a variety in the divine ſervice, it ſoon becomes languid, and gives way to diſtractions.

Q. Was there any other uſe for the ceremonies of the Old Teſtament, that could promote the eſtabliſhment of ſome in the new?

A. I ſay, finally, that they ſerved to recall to the minds of the Iſraelites the ancient times and ſtates through which their fathers had paſſed. Thus, when they ate the paſchal lamb in great haſte, with their reins girt, their ſhoes on their feet, and holding ſtaves in their hands, this ceremony put them in mind, that they were the poſterity of the firſt Iſraelites, who were neceſſitated to eat the paſchal lamb in this manner, as they were to quit Egypt in great haſte.* In the ſame manner, the cuſtom of their being allowed to walk to a certain diſtance on the Sabbath day,† made them reflect, that they were the deſcendants of the Iſraelites, who marched through the deſert, ſome of whoſe tents were the diſtance of this meaſure from the tabernacle, and who, of courſe, were obliged to walk ſo far to repair to the tabernacle, as the law of God preſcribed.

Q. Apply theſe three obſervations to the ceremonies of the chriſtian Church, to ſhew in what light we ſhould look on them, in order to receive benefit from them, according to the Holy Scripture.

A. When we behold the profound reſpect of the Church for God, and all things that are conſecrated to him, we ought to enter into ſuch ſentiments of reverence, as never to appear in the houſe of God, nor be preſent at the worſhip exhibited to him, without a religious fear and awe in the preſence of the King of Kings, before whom all the monarchs of the world are a mere nothing.

---

* Exod. xii. 11. † Acts i. 12.

Q. Which is the ſecond advantage Chriſtians ought to reap from the ceremonies of the Church?

A. They ought to make uſe of theſe helps, when they are in want of them, to keep up their attention at the divine ſervice, that they may glorify God in his houſe, by an uninterrupted devotion, as far as human weakneſs will permit. It is likewiſe very uſeful to ſtudy the meaning of the ceremonies we often ſee, that they may be ſerviceable in bringing to our minds the things they repreſent. If there be any, the ſignification of which we do not yet know, we muſt act as we do, in regard to thoſe paſſages of the Holy Scripture, the ſenſe of which we do not underſtand. This does not hinder us from reſpecting theſe paſſages, and ſubſtituting a moral edifying ſenſe, for the literal, which we cannot explain. Thus we may, with great advantage, affix the remembrance of ſome myſtery, or duty, to ceremonies, when we are ignorant of the true reaſon of their inſtitution, that, notwithſtanding our ignorance, they may help to raiſe our hearts to God.

Q. Which is the third advantage the Scripture directs us to draw from the ceremonies of the Church?

A. It is to conſider in them, the marks of the antiquity of the Church. The uncommon dreſs of the Prieſts, and the language uſed in the ſervice, contribute to ſhew us, that the body of the Catholic Church ſubſiſted from the times, in which theſe things were in common uſe: the lights recall to our minds, that the Catholic Church is that ancient ſociety, that hath exiſted ever ſince the firſt ages, when the perſecutions of Pagan Emperors obliged the Chriſtians to hold their aſſemblies in dark retired places, or in the night: the ſolemn benediction of the fonts at Eaſter and Pentecoſt, the curtain drawn before the altar in Lent, the kiſs of peace that precedes communion, ſhew that the Catholic Church is not a new Church, but that it had a being in thoſe remote times, when ſolemn baptiſm was only adminiſtered at Eaſter or Pentecoſt, when the altar was not

uncovered till the Catechumens were gone out, and when the faithful, in token of union, ſaluted each other with the kiſs of peace before the communion. Many other things, relative to the diſpoſition of the ſacred places, to the actions of the Prieſts, and to the compoſition of the office, atteſt the antiquity of the Church.

Q. Proteſtants then ought not to boaſt, that our ceremonies are expunged from their ſervice?

A. The hand of an adorable providence appears in their effacing, in their Church, all the veſtiges of antiquity. God intended, by this, to ſupply a freſh mark, that they are a very new ſociety. As for us, it is our glory to hear them reproach us with our ceremonies, even with thoſe, that appear to be no longer of uſe. Hence this advantage always attends our ceremonies, that they point out ours to be the ancient Church of that time, when circumſtances made their eſtabliſhment very uſeful. The laity, and even Eccleſiaſtics, on account of their numbers, and different diſpoſitions of mind, would not allow a change in the ſolemn ceremonies of the ſervice to be often made, even after the cauſe, that gave riſe to their original inſtitution, was removed. For which reaſon, a ſociety, in which we do not ſee any of theſe ceremonies, which no one would think of beginning to eſtabliſh in theſe days, muſt neceſſarily be a new ſociety; as on the other hand, wherever theſe ceremonies are found, they are marks of antiquity.

Q. How ought one to conduct one's ſelf in regard to practices, which the moſt learned Divines own to be new, and which are ſo far from inſpiring us with the remembrance of holy things, and a ſpirit of reſpect for God, that they draw the mind to worldly objects, and are unworthy the ſanctity of the divine ſervice?

A. Theſe are abuſes, which ſuperiors ought to retrench; if they do not, the faithful ought not to partake in them, but to bemoan and complain of them to their conductors; and by thus bearing with what they cannot remedy, even here to make an advantage of theſe diſorders, by a

holy tolerance. Thus the Bleſſed Virgin, and the reſt of the faithful in her time, conducted themſelves in regard of the profanation of the Temple, which was made a place of ſale. In the ſame manner have Chriſtians, of all ages, comported themſelves in regard of abuſes, which the negligence of conductors, or the obſtinacy and oppoſition of the people, retained in the Church.

Q. Proteſtants place Holy Water and Proceſſions, in the liſt of Ceremonies, that are abuſes.

A. They are much in the wrong. For we may reap advantage from them, when viewed in the lights in which I have ſhewn the Scripture directs us to look on Ceremonies.

Q. Shew this in regard of Holy Water.

A. It ought to ſuggeſt to our minds the moſt profound reſpect for the houſe of God, becauſe it is a ſymbol, by which the Church admoniſhes us, even at the door, that the place into which we are about to enter is holy; it ſhould cauſe us to reflect on the purity of mind and heart, with which we ought to aſſiſt in the Church, and move us to beg of God the pardon of our ſins and the Grace of the Holy Ghoſt, to cleanſe and prepare us to preſent our adorations to God in a manner, that may be pleaſing to him: in ſhort, it ſhould help to point out the antiquity of the Church, becauſe it clearly appears to be the remains of a cuſtom the firſt Chriſtians obſerved, of waſhing their hands, and even their faces, before they entered the Church, in water prepared for the purpoſe.

Q. Shew likewiſe that the Proteſtants ought not to inveigh againſt Proceſſions, as prejudicial ceremonies.

A. The faithful, who attend, ſhould be preſent with a mind full of reſpect for God, who is glorified by the praiſes and ſupplications addreſſed to him, and which reſound on all ſides, both in and out of the Church. They ſhould uſe them as helps to keep up their attention in their prayers; for ſuch is man's infirmity, that

having as it were exhausted all his attention in one place, he finds the activity of his mind restored by going into another, which without such a change would not have happened. Finally, processions may be considered as a mark, that the Catholic Church is that same Church, that existed in ancient times, when the Christians, animated with reverence for martyrdom, went from their principal Church to those holy places, where the martyrs were interred, to excite themselves to a fervent adoration of God, by the presence of their sacred bodies. Besides, this Ceremony should be so much the more respected as the Holy Scripture teaches us by the example of the Royal prophet, the manner of practising it. *I shall go over*, says he, *into the place of the wonderful tabernacle, even to the house of God: with the voice of joy and praise; the noise of one feasting.* *

Q. What should we say to those, who are not satisfied with these reasons drawn either from the antiquity of the ceremonies, or the advantage they are of to the people, or the difficulties that would occur in attempting to lay them aside, and who notwithstanding these reasons and others of the same kind, continue in their opposition and bitter invectives against the ceremonies of the Church?

A. We should observe to them, that it is principally on this subject that the Apostles have said, *If any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom nor the Church of God.* †

Q. You must likewise explain some principal ceremonies of the external part of the Church service, which Protestants say are expresly condemned by the Holy Scripture, as images, and the latin language used in the services and festivals.

A. It is easy to shew, that the Church is so far from opposing the word of God in these matters, that it

* Ps. lxi. 5. † 1 Cor. xi. 6

teaches nothing on theſe ſubjects, but what is founded on the ſame divine word.

Q. Before you enter into the detail, pleaſe to explain a general difficulty, by which Proteſtants pretend to ſhew, that all ceremonies are contrary to the Holy Scripture: their objection is taken from the paſſage of St. John, where it is ſaid; *God is a ſpirit, and they that adore him, muſt adore him in ſpirit and in truth.* *

A. They who complain, that ceremonies are an impediment to the adoration of God in ſpirit and in truth, do not conſider them in the ſpirit of the Church. It cannot be denied but that in all ſocieties, the generality of the people uſually ſtop at the exterior ceremonies, whether they have few or many, and do not move on to the practice of that, which is propoſed to them. And every one agrees that this is the effect, not of this outward appearance, but of the evil diſpoſitions of mankind. The Catholic Religion, in particular, condemns this Jewiſh ſpirit, and deſires that her children ſhould make uſe of ceremonies to adore God in ſpirit and in truth, by not ſtopping at the outſide or the letter of the ceremonies, but by penetrating into the ſpirit of them. As when by means of the letters of the word of God that one reads, or by the ſounds of the word of God that one hears, the mind is furniſhed with what theſe characters and ſounds ſignify, we think no more of theſe external ſymbols, but are occupied with the truths they have conveyed to our mind: ſo when the ceremonies of the Church have brought to our minds the holy thoughts for which, I have evinced from the Holy Scripture, God deſigned them, we muſt no longer confine our thoughts to the external ſymbols, but apply the faculties of the ſoul to theſe conſiderations. The ceremonies of the Church then conduce to make us adore God in ſpirit and in truth, and are far from being repugnant to this internal

* John iv. 14.

adoration; for this is the uſe made of them by the Saints mentioned in Holy Scripture.

CHAP. VIII.

Of Images.

Q. DOES the word of God forbid Images?

A. It approves of thoſe uſed as ornaments and memorials. For God commanded Moſes to place Cherubim, which were Images of Angels, over the ark and the tabernacle; there were alſo two ſtatues of Cherubim upon the ark. * The High Prieſt had alſo pomegranates of purple on his veſtment. † In the Temple, a building, which was well pleaſing to God, as he ſhewed by his miraculous appearance in it, Solomon placed oxen of braſs under the great laver, that was called the ſea, and figures of oxen, lions and Cherubim about the ſmaller lavers. ‡ So much for the religious uſe of Images: as to the civil uſe of them, the Holy Scripture likewiſe repreſents ſtatues of lions about Solomon's throne. § And we ſee in the Goſpel, that our Lord does not reprimand the Jews for uſing money ſtamped with the image of Cæſar. ‖

Q. Does the Holy Scripture tell us any thing more concerning Images?

A. We may ſet down here the other ſacred memorials mentioned in the Holy Scripture. Joſhua, for example, choſe twelve perſons, by an expreſs order of God, and commanded them to go before the ark, and to take each a ſtone out of the Jordan, to ſet it in the place of the camp as a ſign, that when their children ſhould aſk

---

* Exod. xxv. and xxvi.
† Exod. xxviii. 33.
‡ 1 Kings vii. 24, 25, 29.
§ 1 Kings x. 19.
‖ Matt. xxii. 21.

their fathers what theſe ſtones meant, they ſhould anſwer them, that they had taken them from the bottom of the Jordan, when it was dried up, at the paſſage of the ark. * This memorial was nothing but an image of this miraculous event.

Q. Continue to relate what the Holy Scripture furniſhes in behalf of Images.

A. The Letters themſelves, that compoſe the Holy Scripture, are ſo many Images of the things taught in it. If this ſpecies of imagery is permitted, and even neceſſary, why ſhould the others be poſitively prohibited, ſince they are only for the ſame uſe, namely, to excite in our minds, the memory of things paſt, or of ſpiritual things? Beſides, we ſee in the Holy Scripture, that all the Prophets ſpoke of God, as if he had eyes, ears, arms, &c. It is not more criminal to form Images in our imagination, by objects preſented to our eyes, than to form them there by words reſounded in our ears; both being deſigned to aſſiſt our minds by theſe material Images, at which we do not ſtop, but raiſe them up to the ſpiritual object, which we revere.

Q. Go on, relating the obſervations you have made in the Holy Scriptures, concerning the lawful uſe of Images.

A. We ſee there, that God preſented himſelf to Daniel under the figure of an old man, † and to St. John, with a face reſembling the brightneſs of a jaſper ſtone. ‡ The Holy Ghoſt ſhewed himſelf to men, under the ſymbol of a Dove, and in tongues of fire. § Here are Images, which God himſelf made uſe of to fix the human mind on thoſe qualities, to which he wanted moſt to draw their attention. Why ſhould it be unlawful to repreſent ſymbols, which God himſelf hath made, or to make Images, ſince he himſelf has pleaſed to do the ſame?

---

* Jos. iv. 5. † Dan. vii. 9. ‡ Apoc. iv. 3.
§ Matt. iii. 16. Acts ii. 3.

Q. What do you conclude from this?

A. I infer that Images are useful, when they are designed to instruct men, or to recall to their minds mysteries, in which they are instructed, or to animate and enliven their ideas in regard of those they reflect on.

Q. Which are the Images God prohibits in his law? *

A: Those which the Pagans served and adored. For which reason the Catholic Church abhors the serving and adoring of Images.

Q. How do you know that the law of God only forbids the Images, which the Pagans served, and not the Images, which Catholics make use of?

A. By explaining the Scripture by the Scripture. For we must consult the passages, that treat of the same subject, and we shall see there that by these Images were only understood such as they esteemed as Gods. *Adore not any strange God. The Lord, his name is Jealous, he is a jealous God.* † *Thou shalt not make to thyself any molten Gods.* ‡ *Turn ye not to idols, nor make to yourselves molten Gods.* It appears from this passage, and several others of the same kind, that the Images, which God wanted the Jews to hold in abhorrence, were those they looked on as Gods.

Q. Is there any thing else in the different passages of Moses against Images, which may help to shew they should not be turned against the Images erected by Catholics?

A. I add that Moses gives for a reason of this prohibition of images, the impossibility of figuring God. § This reason strikes at the Pagans, who pretended to represent their Deities by their images. Catholics believe on the contrary that God is a Spirit, and that it is impossible to represent him by corporeal

* Exod. xx. 4.
† Exod. xxxiv. 14, 17
‡ Lev. xix. 4.
§ Deut. iv. 16.

images. Even those among them, whom the Protestants reproach with making images of God, have no design of representing God himself, but only of making imperfect symbols of some of his perfections, and even the symbols which God himself has chosen, viz. that of a man who appeared to the Prophets * and that of a dove, which was seen at our Lord's Baptism. All Catholics have an abhorrence of representing God by Images of any other kind.

Q. Are there not grounds in the Decalogue for the explanation you have given of the prohibition of Images?

A. There are several very plain. God says: *Thou shalt not make strange gods before me. Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing.* The Images therefore meant in this place are other Gods erected against the true one: *Thou shalt not make to thyself the likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or of those things that are in the waters under the earth.* This division has a manifest reference to the Images of the Sun and the Stars, that were adored by the Chananeans, and of the Ox adored by the Egyptians, and to those of the Serpents and Fishes adored by the Egyptians and Philistines; as it was God's design to have preserved the Jews from these idolatries, a people easily seduced by the example of the surrounding nations.

Q. Is this all you find in this law, that fixes the meaning to Pagan Images?

A. God was pleased that all the words employed here should point out the truth of this explanation. *Thou shalt not adore them*, adds he, *thou shalt not serve them.* The Images therefore meant here, are such as are adored and served. *For I am a jealous God:* they are images substituted instead of God, and which on that account excite his jealousy. *I visit the iniquity of*

* Is. vi. Ezech. i. 16, Dan. x. 5.

the fathers upon the third and fourth generation of them that hate me: they are therefore *Images made by thoſe who hate God.* Now this word is only applied in Scripture to thoſe, that adored the Pagan Idols. Theſe Images then are made by perſons, that wiſhed there was no God, and even hated him; Images, to which was rendered the worſhip due to God alone, and which on that account raiſed his jealouſy; they are images, that were adored and ſerved; Images of the Gods of the nations, with whom the Iſraelites were connected; in ſhort, they are images that were other Gods.

Q. Does this point out any difference between the Images allowed by Catholics, and thoſe prohibited in this commandment?

A. Moſt undoubtedly: for with them Images are not looked upon as Deities, or as filled with any Divine power; they are not the Pagan Images of the Sun, of the Moon, and the Stars, of Oxen, of Serpents, and Fiſhes, clearly indicated here by the Holy Ghoſt. They are not Images ſet up in the place of God, and conſequently objects of his jealouſy: they are not Images made out of hatred to God; but on the contrary through love of him, to bring into our minds the more frequent and lively remembrance of his favors.

Q. Can you draw any clear proof from the Holy Scripture, to ſhew how prepoſterous it is to extend to Images, that are only deſigned to be memorials, what the law of God hath only ſpoken againſt Images intended for Idols, or as objects of adoration?

A. God had expreſſed himſelf as poſitively and expreſsly againſt pillars and great ſtones, as againſt Images: *I am the Lord your God.* ſays he, *you ſhall not erect pillars, nor ſet up a remarkable ſtone in your land to adore it.* * Nevertheleſs Joſhua erected twelve ſtones for a memorial of the miraculous paſſage of the Jordan;

* Lev. xxvi. 1.

and towards the end of his life he ſet up another under an oak, to be a memorial of the alliance contracted through his miniſtry between God and the people of Iſrael.* And when this people were told, that the ſtones erected in the form of an altar by the tribes were only intended for a memorial of the union with the other tribes, that were ſeparated from them by the Jordan, all ſcandal and wonder ceaſed, and the people were ſatisfied.† Samuel likewiſe ſet up a ſtone for a memorial of a ſignal victory gained over the Philiſtines.‡

Q. Make an application of this to the ſubject of Images.

A. Though God ſaid *you ſhall not erect pillars, and you ſhall not ſet up a remarkable ſtone to adore it;* yet it was permitted to erect ſuch as were only deſigned for memorials. In like manner, though God has prohibited the making of Images for adoration, yet it is evident we may make ſuch as in like manner are only intended to be memorials of thoſe things, which God would have us bear in remembrance.

Q. What you have ſaid does not clear the Catholics, ſeveral of whom have written that they adore Images. It is even common among them, particularly on Good Friday, to ſay, they adore the Croſs.

A. When we either read, or hear ſuch, or ſimilar expreſſions, we owe this juſtice to thoſe, who uſe them, to believe they do not underſtand the word to adore in the ſame ſenſe, in which it is applied to God, and that they only intend by it to denote ſome external mark of reſpect for Images. Nothing is more uſual in Scripture than this meaning of the word to adore, the uſe of which has been continued on ſome occaſions; for it frequently repreſents in this ſenſe, Angels, Patriarchs, Prophets, and Kings adored by others, and this by uſing the ſame word, by which it commonly expreſſes the

---

* Jos. iv. 20, xxiv. 26. † Jos. xxii. 30. ‡ 1 Sam. vii. 12.

adoration given to God. * In all theſe paſſages we muſt neceſſarily underſtand by the word *to adore*, or to worſhip, only ſome external marks of honor and reverence. We muſt take it in the ſame ſenſe when uſed in regard of Images.

Q. We do not find in the verſions of the Holy Scripture given by Proteſtants, this word to adore, uſed to repreſent the honor men give to each other, or to Angels.

A. Your obſervation is a proof of the little fidelity they have ſometimes ſhewn in tranſlating the Holy Scripture. It is certain that the ſame Hebrew word, which ſignifies, *to adore*, when ſpoken of God, is the ſame found in the original, to repreſent that infinitely inferior honor given by one man to another, or to Angels, that appeared to men. This induced the tranſlators of the Vulgate to uſe the ſame word in theſe different places. But the Proteſtants, who had no mind that their people ſhould find in the Holy Scripture any paſſages, which might prove that Catholics could uſe the word *to adore*, in order to ſignify the honor given to creatures, have ſubſtituted that of to bow down in the paſſages, that only treat of the honor paid to creatures. In France, they retained in their firſt tranſlations the word to adore in two of theſe paſſages; that is, in thoſe where it is ſaid that Miphiboſeth and Joab adored David; † but in their verſion of 1588, which is uſed at preſent, they baniſhed the word to adore from theſe two paſſages, that their people might not read in their Bibles, that it was lawful to expreſs by the word to adore, the honor given to creatures.

Q. Have you nothing more to add on this ſubject?

A. I obſerve further, that in the paſſages of the Apo-

---

* Gen. xviii. 2, xix. 1, xlviii. 12, 2 Sam. i. 2, ix. 6. 1 Kings i. 23, 2 Kings ii. 15, iv. 37. 1 Chron. xxix. 20.

† 2 Sam. ix. 6, xiv. 22.

calypſe, where mention is made of the honor given to an angel by St. John, Proteſtants have not, as in the other parts, made uſe of the word to bow down, but to worſhip before the angel: the reaſon is obvious; they have uſed the word to bow down, and left out to adore or worſhip in thoſe paſſages, in which the angels receive and approve of the honor given them by the faithful; and on the contrary in thoſe, in which the angels ſeem to condemn the honor given them, they have uſed the word to adore, or to worſhip, and have left out that of to bow down, that the indignation of their people might be raiſed againſt the Church as often as they ſhould find the word to adore uſed by Catholics, to expreſs the honor they give to creatures. Yet they cannot deny but that the ſame Hebrew or Greek word which ſignifies to adore, is alike uſed in the different paſſages. This ſhould make every one ſenſible of that ſpirit of partiality, with which they have tranſlated the Holy Scripture.

Q. Is it not contrary to the word of God to bow, as is ſometimes done, before theſe images, that are only memorials?

A. No. For the word of God directs us to give external marks of reſpect to ſacred things,* but we ought at the ſame time to raiſe our hearts to God, as the Iſraelites did when they proſtrated themſelves before the ark.

Q. Do not we read in the Holy Scripture, that Ezechias broke the brazen ſerpent, and reduced it to aſhes, becauſe the Iſraelites burnt incenſe before it?† Does not this ſeem to condemn the honor you pay to Images, and particularly that of incenſe, which is burnt on ſome occaſions?

A. This paſſage only treats of the honors, that were peculiar to the Deity, that is, ſacrifices. In reality,

* Jos. vii. 6. † 2 Kings xviii.

when this honor paid to the brazen ſerpent is mentioned, we muſt ſuppoſe that ſacrifice was offered at the ſame time, as incenſe never was burnt on any other occaſion. Theſe two things are commonly joined together in the Old Teſtament, becauſe the burning of incenſe was a ceremony, that was obſerved in the ſacrifices, both of the true God, and of Idols. For which reaſon, as the Holy Scripture, in mentioning the ſacrifices, implies this ceremony; ſo when it expreſſes it only, ſacrifices are alſo implied. *The children of Iſrael*, it ſays, *burnt incenſe upon altars after the manner of the nations.* * *In all the cities of Juda he built altars to burn frankincenſe.* † *Amaſias ſet up the Gods of the children of Seir: he adored them, and burnt incenſe to them.* ‡ *Joſias deſtroyed them that burnt incenſe to Baal, and to the ſun, and to the moon, and to the twelve ſigns, and to all the hoſt of heaven.* § It is manifeſt that in theſe paſſages, and ſeveral others of the ſame kind, where incenſe is mentioned, we muſt likewiſe underſtand the ſacrifice which ordinarily accompanied it. We muſt in like manner underſtand theſe ſacrifices, when mention is made of the incenſe burnt to the brazen ſerpent. Thus as it manifeſtly ſpeaks of ſacrifices in this place, which are only offered to the Deity, this example cannot be adduced on the ſubject of Images, to which we give no honor that is reſerved to God.

Q. Extend this anſwer by applying it in particular to the incenſe burnt before Images.

A. As incenſe is now frequently burnt without ſacrifice, and is not appropriated to God in any paſſage of the New Teſtament, it is no longer a certain mark of adoration. In reality, Catholics incenſe the books of the Goſpels, the altar, the pillars of Churches, the prieſts, the people, and even dead bodies; yet no one

* 2 Kings xvii. 11.
† 2 Chron. xxviii. 25.
‡ Ibid. xxv. 14.
§ 2 Kings xxiii. 5.

ever thinks of charging them with the adoration of all theſe things. So that it would be moſt unjuſt to compare the incenſe ſometimes burnt before Images, with the incenſe, which the Iſraelites burnt to the brazen ſerpent.

Q. Explain more particularly the ſin of the Iſraelites in regard of the brazen ſerpent, to ſhew more diſtinctly that Catholics are not guilty of any thing of the kind in regard of Images.

A. We may here look on the Iſraelites, either as ſuperſtitious in adoring the God of Iſrael in a place where there was ſome illuſtrious monument of his glory, or as Idolaters ſeeking their God in the brazen ſerpent.

Q. Explain both theſe ways in which they may be conſidered.

A. I ſay firſt of all, that it is not certain that the Iſraelites, mentioned in the paſſage you have objected, were idolaters. The moſt common fault of thoſe times, was the abuſe of places made ſacred by ſome miraculous favor, or by the piety of the Patriarchs. In theſe places the Iſraelites ſometimes offered ſacrifices to God, as their anceſtors had done before the building of the temple. Theſe are the places, which the Holy Scripture uſually calls high places. *The people*, ſays the Holy Ghoſt, *ſacrificed in the high places: for there was no temple built to the name of the Lord. And Solomon loved the Lord, walking in the precepts of David his father, only he ſacrificed in the high places: and burnt incenſe.* * *Nevertheleſs*, ſays the Holy Spirit, ſpeaking of the time when Manaſſes repented, *the people ſtill ſacrificed in the high places to the Lord their God.* † There is then great reaſon to believe that the Jews, who were accuſtomed to ſacrifice in places, that had been ſanctified by ſome miraculous favor of God, had choſen for one of theſe high places, and even for one of the principal of them,

* 1 Kings iii. 2, 3. † 2 Chron. xxxiii. 17.

the place where the brazen ſerpent was kept, that God had cauſed to be erected in the deſert, when he cured them of the bite of the fiery ſerpents.

Q. Apply this anſwer to the ſubject before us.

A. As it was the will of God, that the Iſraelites ſhould only ſacrifice in the temple, the kings, whom he inſpired with zeal for his ſervice, deſtroyed thoſe high places, notwithſtanding the ſuperſtitious attachment of the people to continue their ſacrifices on them. It gives this teſtimony of Ezechias in particular, even in the very verſe, in which we are told that he broke the brazen ſerpent. This pious king probably broke it in pieces with this intent. He was reſolved to prevent the people from carrying their victims and incenſe any more to this place, and to oblige them to take them to the temple, where God would receive them. This fact then has no reference to any thing performed by Catholics in regard of Images; for they are not even accuſed of making ſuch an ill uſe of them, as to offer ſacrifices to them; a homage, which God indiſpenſably requires to be paid to himſelf.

Q. Proceed now to the other explanation of this abuſe of the Iſraelites in regard of the brazen ſerpent.

A. As it is related in the verſe that mentions the fact, that *Ezechias did not only deſtroy the high places, but likewiſe cut down the groves and broke the ſtatues in pieces,* * there is reaſon to doubt whether the Iſraelites, who were violently inclined to idolatry, were not really idolaters in regard of the brazen ſerpent, by adoring it as the Egyptians had adored ſerpents, and as the Gentiles, in their neighbourhood, adored their ſtatues, or at leaſt by looking on this ſerpent as a place where the God of Iſrael reſided, in the ſame manner as the Pagans imagined the conſecration of their ſtatues, rendered them the habitations of their Deities. If the Iſraelites were

* 2 Kings xviii. 4.

poſſeſſed with this belief, when they preſented to the brazen ſerpent their incenſe mentioned in the Holy Scripture, they were really idolaters; and it is aſtoniſhing, that any one will obſtinately perſiſt in comparing to ſo deteſtable an idolatry, the behaviour of Catholics in regard of Images, ſince they neither look on them as Deities, nor as the reſidences of the Deity, ſince they do not even acknowledge any inherent virtue in them, and even profeſs they have no confidence in, and do not addreſs any prayer to them.

A. What ſhould one conclude from the action of king Ezechias in reprehending the ſin of the Iſraelites, according to your laſt interpretation?

A. I infer from hence, that when people make an ill uſe of Images, by looking on them as the habitations of the Divinity, by addreſſing prayers to them, and by hoping for favors from them, it does not belong to private perſons to deſtroy them, as none of the prophets, nor of the faithful before Ezechias had dared to attempt it in regard of the brazen ſerpent. But if they who have received authority from God, cannot put a ſtop to ſuch idolatry by inſtructions concerning the true uſe of images, they are obliged to deſtroy all thoſe, which, by the abuſe made of them, are the occaſion of ſo heinous an offence.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Language of the Service.

Q. WHAT does the Word of God teach concerning the uſe of a language unknown to the people in the divine ſervice?

A. It is approved of there. For the Hebrew language, in which the Jewiſh ſervice was always performed, was unknown to them after the Babyloniſh captivity. Yet

the faithful of thoſe times, as the Bleſſed Virgin, St. Joſeph, St. Ann the Propheteſs, St. Elizabeth were not on that account leſs aſſiduous in attending the ſervice, though they did not underſtand the language.

Q. How do you know that the Jewiſh people did not underſtand the Hebrew language after the Babyloniſh captivity?

A. Beſides the agreement of the learned on both ſides, this appears from the New Teſtament. For we find there in ſeveral paſſages ſome words of the language then in uſe among the Jews, that are Syriac, and widely differing from the Hebrew words, as *Raca*, *Sabacthani*, *Talitha*, *Gabbatha*, *Golgotha*, *Aceldama*, *Tabitha*.*

Q. Does this uſe of the Hebrew language in the ſervice of the temple, when this language was become unintelligible to the people, appear to be approved of in the Holy Scripture, by none but the faithful of the Old Teſtament?

A. It there appears to be approved of by our Lord and his Apoſtles, who likewiſe aſſiſted at the ſervice. They ſeverely condemned the abuſes they found among the Jews, and yet we do not ſee they ever cenſured the language of their ſervice.

Q. What do you infer from thence?

A. I infer, that to condemn with Proteſtants the uſe of the ancient language of the Liturgy, becauſe it is become unknown to the people, is to condemn not only all the Chriſtian Church of paſſed ages, which never thought of changing the language of the Liturgy, in proportion as the living language changed; but includes likewiſe a condemnation of that, which the Faithful, whoſe example is recommended to us in the Holy Scripture, have not condemned, and which Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles themſelves have not condemned.

Q. St. Paul directs all things to be done in the Church

* Matt. v. 22, Matt. xxvii. 46, Mark v. 41, Jo. xix, 13, 17, Act. i. 19, Act. ix. 40.

for edification.* Little regard is paid to the edification of the people, when the ſervice is performed in a language they do not underſtand.

A. We ought rather to look on this paſſage of St. Paul as a reaſon for eſtabliſhing the uſe of the Latin language in the public ſervice.

Q. How can this be?

A. Becauſe if it had been the practice to alter the language of the ſervice, as the living language changed, it would frequently have happened, that ſome would have wiſhed to change a word, which others would have deſired to retain, ſome would have wiſhed to ſubſtitute one word, which pleaſed them, and which others would not have tolerated. Nothing would have been more unedifying than to have been regardleſs of the peace of the Church, and to have inſiſted on an alteration of the language as often as the living language might change, without regard to the diſſenſions or diviſions, that might be occaſioned by it.

Q. Is it then the love of edification, that obliges the Church to preſerve the ancient language of the ſervice?

A. Yes. For as this edification principally induces her to guard againſt diviſions, that are generally occaſioned by alterations in things, to which the people are accuſtomed, ſhe, on this account, continues to uſe the ancient language. And to remove the ignorance of the people, ſhe explains the ſervice by the mouths of her Miniſters, and in the books ſhe puts into the hands of her children.

Q. Proteſtants then ought not to boaſt very much of their uſing a known language in their ſervice.

A. They ought on the contrary to be convinced by this, that they are not the true Church. For the averſion people have to changes in things, to which they are accuſtomed, makes ſuch a change of the ſervice im-

* 1 Cor. xiv. 26.

practicable. A ſociety, that uſes a known language in its ſervice, cannot be an ancient ſociety; and of courſe is not the Church, which Jeſus Chriſt and his Apoſtles founded ſixteen hundred years ago.

Q. Does it appear from the Holy Scripture, that one may be edified by aſſiſting at the public ſervice, which one does not underſtand?

A. Samuel's mother was edified when praying in the Temple, though ſhe did not apply herſelf to any thing the Prieſts might ſay who performed the ſervice.* The Publican was ſo far from thinking he could not receive any edification in the houſe of God, unleſs he underſtood what the public Miniſters ſaid, that he ſtood at the greateſt diſtance from them.† St. Luke obſerves that when Zachary offered incenſe, the Jews ſaw and heard ſo little of what he ſaid or did, that they waited along time without knowing what had happened to him; and in general though the people did not underſtand the language of the ſervice in the Temple after their return from Babylon, yet the conſtant attendance of the Faithful in the Temple, particularly on the three great Feſtivals, is a convincing proof, how much they were edified without underſtanding the ſervice.

Q. Have Proteſtants reaſon to cite the fourteenth chapter of the firſt to the Corinthians, againſt the uſe of the Latin language in the ſervice?

A. No. For notwithſtanding the Holy Ghoſt in this chapter has condemned the unknown tongue, which the Corinthians uſed in the Church, Jeſus Chriſt and the Apoſtles did not think proper to condemn the Hebrew language uſed by the Jewiſh Church in the Temple, though become totally unintelligible to the people. Whatever anſwer then they make to reconcile what St. Paul ſays in the fourteenth chapter of the firſt to the Corinthians, with the approbation, which Jeſus Chriſt

---

* 1 Sam. i. 11. † Luke xviii. 13.

and his Apoſtles gave by their ſilence, to the uſe of the Hebrew tongue in the liturgy of the Temple; we give the ſame to reconcile this chapter with the uſe of the Latin tongue, in the liturgy of our Churches.

Q. Tell us yourſelf how one ought to reconcile this chapter with the uſe the Church makes of Latin in its ſervice?

A. This uſe and that which St. Paul blames in the Corinthians, differ in four or five points.

Q. Which is the firſt?

A. The Church was then in its infancy. But a Church at ſuch a time, that is, at its firſt eſtabliſhment, cannot ſee any cauſe in the diſpoſitions of its people, to oblige it to give its ſervice in a language unknown to them; on the contrary the ſtate of their minds generally incline them to their own maternal language. This made the Apoſtles appoint the ſervice in Greek to the Greeks, and in Arabic to the Arabians, at the ſame time they gave it to the Latins in Latin. But we cannot draw any conſequence from a Church in its infant ſtate, to the Church that now is above ſeventeen hundred years old. In this laſt ſtate it cannot be ſaid to have it in its option to chooſe the language of its ſervice; but it is neceſſarily fixed in the continuance of the ancient language by the people, who are accuſtomed to it. Beſides, at the firſt eſtabliſhment the people do not know what the ſervice contains; ſo that it is proper to give it them in a language they underſtand; but afterwards they know the different parts, of which the ſervice is compoſed, ſo that in whatever language it is performed, one may employ ones mind before God in thoughts ſuited to it, as Catholics do at preſent, who aſſiſt at the ſervice with devotion according to the ſpirit of the Church.

Q. Which is the ſecond difference, betwixt the uſe of the Latin tongue in the ſervice of the Church, and what St. Paul blames in the Corinthians?

A. The Apoſtle particularly cenſures the uſe of an

unknown tongue in preaching. In reality, as the end of preaching is to inſtruct, it would be abſurd to preach to a people in a language they do not underſtand. But the Church cannot be accuſed of this; for all her inſtructions, whether in ſermons, exhortations, or catechiſms, are given in the language of the hearers.

Q. In what then does the Church uſe the Latin language?

A. The Latin is only uſed in that part of the ſervice, which is deſigned for edification in prayer. Now I have already ſhewn, that the edification, which the Faithful find in praying to and adoring God, may be met with in a ſervice they do not underſtand. The experience itſelf of an infinity of Catholics proves demonſtratively that their ſervice, though not underſtood, excites in them a ſpirit of attention, of reſpect, of recollection and application to all the parts of prayer. I will even add that, ſince experience evinces there is leſs of this ſpirit of prayer in the beſt Proteſtants, than amongſt the beſt Catholics, it cannot be true, whatever they may allege, that their ſervice is more edifying than our's, I mean, better adapted to inſpire a ſpirit of recollection and interior adoration.

Q. Which is the third difference betwixt the conduct of the Corinthians, which St. Paul condemns, and that of the Church?

A. The language, which St. Paul condemns in the ſermons and prayers of the Corinthians was truly an unknown tongue; for neither did the people underſtand it, nor was there even any one in the whole aſſembly that could interpret it; ſo that they could not ſafely anſwer *Amen*. They could not tell whether that man, who prayed in an unknown tongue, prayed to God or blaſphemed, or whether in his exhortations he taught truth or hereſy.

Q. How is the Catholic Church unlike to the conduct of the Corinthians in this?

A. The language, which ſhe employs in her ſervice,

is not an unknown tongue of this kind. For beſides that when one of the Miniſters of the Church is praying, the others underſtand his language, great numbers of the people, and even the enemies of the Church underſtand it. Thus they, who do not underſtand it themſelves, are thoroughly perſuaded that holy prayers are offered to God, and can therefore join in ſpirit, and with the greateſt confidence anſwer *Amen*.

Q. Which is the fourth difference betwixt the conduct of the Corinthians, whom St. Paul condemns, and that of the Catholics?

A. The Corinthians only acted through a ſpirit of pride, and ſhewed the moſt ſcandalous contempt of public edification, and this in a manner ſo much the more reprehenſible as they abuſed the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, to attract the admiration of Chriſtians. They entered their religious aſſemblies, and without the leaſt concern whether any one underſtood them or not, broached their new languages, the gift of which they had received. They did not trouble themſelves whether others were ſpeaking before them, but were determined at all rates, that all ſhould know they could ſpeak ſtrange languages.

Q. How is the conduct of the Church oppoſite to that of the Corinthians in this regard?

A. The Church acts ſolely through a ſpirit of charity for her children, and an ardent deſire of their edification. She is convinced that if ſhe had determined to change the language of the Liturgy, in conformity to the various alterations of living languages, two or three ages would not elapſe without great diſſenſions in many parts among the people, who cannot bear to have the uſe of thoſe things taken from them, to which they are habituated, and which they know by heart; diſſentions, which would have reigned among their Conductors themſelves, who, on account of their different notions and paſſions, would never be induced to agree about the time and manner of making theſe changes. It is more-

over a ſubject of edification, to ſee that almoſt all Catholics, though ſpread over the whole world, ſpeak the ſame language; which is a mark that they are the children of the ſame mother; and an encouragement to them, wherever they meet, ſince in all places they ſee the ſame ſervice they have been accuſtomed to.

Q. Is there no other difference between the conduct which St. Paul reproves in the Corinthians, and the practice of the Church in the ſervice?

A. We may further take notice, that the Corinthians acted by their own particular authority, without the orders of the Church, and even contrary to its commands. Can there be a ſubject of greater ſcandal than to ſee a ſimple individual take upon himſelf to change the cuſtoms of the Church? Who can doubt but that its authority extends to the outward parts of Religion, ſuch as the language of the Service? The uſe of the Latin language is not in this manner a recent attempt of a few individuals, contrary to the authority of the Church; it is a cuſtom, which the Church itſelf keeps up, by a peaceable and general practice. One may add here, that Proteſtants in this regard reſemble the Corinthians, whom St. Paul reprimands, ſince they are bold enough to oppoſe the Church in the choice of its language.

Q. Does the examination of this chapter only ſhew that St. Paul does not condemn the practice of the Catholic Church?

A. It even evinces that St. Paul expreſsly approves of it; for St. Paul expreſsly and repeatedly teaches in this chapter, that we may uſe in the Church a tongue unknown to the people, provided there be interpretations of what is ſaid.* Now this we have in the Catholic Church, where the Service is literally tranſlated for ſuch as can read, and is explained to others that cannot.

* 1 Cor. xiv. 5, 13, 27.

Q. What do you infer from all this?

A. I infer that it is a ſtrange abuſe of the Holy Scripture, to make uſe of this chapter to condemn the language of the Catholic Service, which is a practice ſo very different from that condemned in it, and which is even manifeſtly approved in it by St. Paul in the plaineſt terms.

Q. What have the Reformers done here, to prevent the people from ſeeing the approbation, which St. Paul gives to the language of the Service, when there are interpretations of it?

A. Their Tranſlators have deceived them, in the ſame manner as I obſerved on the ſubject of traditions. As there are in the Holy Scripture traditions that are approved, and traditions that are condemned, they have retained this word in thoſe paſſages that treat of thoſe, that are condemned, and they have ſuppreſſed it in the paſſages that ſpeak of thoſe, that are approved, becauſe they wanted their people to condemn them all. So in the ſame manner, in the fourteenth chapter of the firſt to the Corinthians, where there is mention of a language unknown to the people, which St. Paul condemns in the Service, and of another unknown language, which he approves, they have uſed the word unknown in the ſecond, fourth, thirteenth, fourteenth, nineteenth, and twenty-ſeventh verſes, where this language is condemned; but in the eighteenth, twenty-ſixth, and thirty-ninth verſes, where this language, that is unknown to the people, is approved in the Service, though the ſame word occurs in the original, they have not, as in the other verſes, made uſe of the word unknown. This plainly ſhews, that they wiſhed to excite in the people an abhorrence for the uſe of an unknown language in the public Service, and for this end did not heſitate to give a fallacious tranſlation of the Scripture.

Q. Is there not in this chapter a verſe, that condemns a certain practice in the Service of ſome of the Reformed Churches?

A. It is expreſsly ſaid there, that the people anſwered, *Amen*, to the public acts of bleſſing. This is obſerved in the Catholic Church; but among the Proteſtants, that follow Calvin's reformation, the people do not anſwer, *Amen*, to the public prayers. They have aboliſhed this practice of the Apoſtles, and introduced into their public prayers that tedious prolixity, which our Lord condemns. As the human mind is eaſily diſguſted with theſe long uniform prayers, our Lord has given a ſhort prayer, to be the model of all prayers; and the Apoſtolic Church, reſpecting this method of our Lord, interrupted its prayers by the acclamations of the people who anſwered, *Amen*. The Pretended Reformers have abandoned the method of Service, to which our Lord and his Apoſtles gave the preference.

CHAP. X.

Of Feſtivals.

Q. Is not the diſtinction of particular days for Feſtivals, which the Church has inſtituted, a ceremony condemned by the Holy Scripture?

A. So far from it, that the word of God obliges us to approve this inſtitution. We ſee there, that our Lord authoriſed by his attendance, the Feſtival, which the old Church had inſtituted, to thank God for the dedication of the temple; a feſtival which, as was cuſtomary with the Jews, was celebrated during the ſpace of eight days. * The Holy Ghoſt in ſeveral places commends thoſe, who ſanctified particular times, by retiring from worldly occupations, to employ themſelves in works of piety. †

* John x. 22. 2 Mach. i. 9. † Luke ii. 26, 37. 1 Cor. vii. 5.

Q. What concluſion do you draw from theſe examples?

A. That the Church has good grounds for conſecrating particular days to meditate on divine myſteries, to praiſe God for the favors he hath conferred on us through Jeſus Chriſt, or by the prayers of the Saints, and to beg his grace that we may improve in virtue, and profit by their examples.

Q. Are theſe Feſtivals contrary to the commandment of God, who ſays, *ſix days ſhalt thou labour?* *

A. The commandment is not contained in thoſe words, but in the following, *Thou ſhalt reſt on the ſeventh day.* The law given to Adam was worded in ſimilar terms: *Thou ſhalt eat of every tree of Paradiſe: but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou ſhalt not eat* † He was not bound to eat of the fruit of all the trees, but only had permiſſion to eat of them.

Q. How do you know that theſe words, *ſix days ſhalt thou labour*, are not an abſolute command, which we muſt indiſpenſably comply with?

A. From the Holy Scripture. For it teaches us that God, who did not diſpenſe, at leaſt ordinarily, with the moral law, eſtabliſhed ſeveral ſolemnities on theſe ſix days, viz. the firſt day of the ſeventh month, and the day of expiations, beſides the three great feaſts of the Paſch, of Pentecoſt, and of Tabernacles; and that ſervile work was prohibited on two days of each of theſe three laſt ſolemnities. The Church of Iſrael, as we are informed by the ſacred writers, likewiſe conſecrated particular days of the week to be ſpent in holy exerciſes inſtead of labour, as it did in ſolemnizing the remembrance of Eſther's deliverance, and the dedication of the temple. ‡

Q. If it were lawful to eſtabliſh holidays in this manner, St. Paul would not have ſaid to the Coloſſians, *let*

* Exod. xx. 9. † Gen. ii. 16, 17. ‡ Eſth. ix. 17. 1 Mach. iv. 59.

no man judge you in reſpect of a feſtival day, or of the new moon, or of the ſabbaths. *

A. It is clear that he only ſpeaks here of the Jewiſh Feſtivals, with the neglect of which the Jews upbraided the firſt Chriſtians.

Q. How do you prove this?

A. This appears from the paſſage itſelf, which mentions the ſabbaths and new moons, which the Jews were accuſtomed to obſerve; from the verſe that follows, where it is ſaid that theſe things are a ſhadow of things to come, and that Jeſus Chriſt is the body; and from the preceding verſes, in which the Apoſtle expreſsly ſpeaks of the old law, which our Lord aboliſhed by his death on the croſs.

Q. This paſſage then is not againſt the obſervation of the Feſtivals of the Catholic Church?

A. No. For it does not follow from our ceaſing to obſerve the Feſtivals, that were intended to repreſent the future coming of Jeſus Chriſt, that we ought not to keep the Chriſtian Feſtivals, which repreſent him as now come, ſuch as thoſe of his nativity, of his death, of his reſurrection, of the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon his Apoſtles, and of that of the ſame Holy Spirit upon the moſt diſtinguiſhed and holy of his ſervants On the contrary it rather follows, that we ought to obſerve them at preſent; for the Feſtivals that repreſented our Lord as about to come, were only aboliſhed, that we might obſerve the Feſtivals, which repreſent that he is come, and has redeemed us.

Q. Should one explain the paſſage of the Epiſtle to the Galatians in the ſame manner, where St. Paul blames them for obſerving *days and months and times and years.* †

A. As St. Paul two verſes before puts the Galatians in mind of the Paganiſm, in which they had lived, it

---

* Col. ii. 16. † Gal. iv. 10.

may be ſaid that they had retained the ſuperſtitious obſervations of the Pagans, who looked on certain days as unlucky days, in which they would not begin any affair of importance, and that the Apoſtle reprimands them on this account. But it is more probable, that as ſeveral of the Galatians after their converſion had been ſeduced by falſe teachers, who mixed Judaiſm with the Chriſtian Religion, as St. Paul ſhews through this whole Epiſtle, he here reproaches them for obſerving the Jewiſh Feſtivals. For this reaſon he ſpeaks in the verſe I have quoted, not only of *days*, but likewiſe of *months*, of *times*, and of *years*. This diſtinction bears a manifeſt relation to the different Feſtivals of the Jews; for they obſerved the ſabbaths, and new moons, particular annual feaſts, and particular years, as the ſeventh year of the Jubilee. This paſſage then to the Galatians, as likewiſe that to the Coloſſians, cannot be alledged againſt Chriſtian Feſtivals, which have no connection with thoſe of the Jews.

Q. One of the principal difficulties of Proteſtants on the ſubject of our Feſtivals, is occaſioned by their diſapprobation of the prayers offered to Saints.

A. As the adoration of God is the eſſential part of Religion, there is no Feſtival, in which the Church does not addreſs its ſervice to God. Thus much may be ſaid in general, becauſe the prayers which make particular mention of the Saints on their Feſtival days, are few in number. Beſides it is eaſy to ſhew, that this recourſe to the interceſſion of Saints, is not at all contrary to the word of God.

CHAP XI.

Of Prayers addreſſed to the Angels and Saints.

Q. SHEW that recourſe to the interceſſion of Angels is not contrary to the word of God.

A. We may, in the firſt place, alledge ſome paſſages, in which David petitions them to praiſe God. *Bleſs the Lord*, ſaid he, *all ye his angels: you that are mighty in ſtrength: bleſs the Lord, all ye his hoſts: you miniſters of his that do his will.** Thus as David, in ſeveral places, entreats the angels to praiſe God for him, it is lawful to deſire them to pray to God for us.

Q. Theſe are not diſcourſes addreſſed to the angels. They are only figurative expreſſions like thoſe, in which David calls upon the Sun, Moon, and all inanimate creatures, to praiſe God.

A. I do not mean to reſt upon this proof, ſince it may be weakened by the obſervation you have mentioned. Yet we may take notice, that there is a difference in theſe expreſſions of the Royal Prophet, which you have compared together. David knew, that the Sun, Moon, and Stars, were inanimate creatures, which did not hear his voice, and could not, properly ſpeaking, celebrate God's praiſes: and he knew, on the contrary, when he ſaid to the angels, bleſs the Lord, that theſe happy ſpirits could give moſt perfect praiſes to God, and that they heard his words inviting them to it. *The angel of the Lord*, ſays he, *ſhall encamp round about them that fear him. God hath given his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways.*†

Q. Have you any other paſſage of the Old Teſtament, that ſeems to authorize this recourſe to Angels?

---

* Pſ. cii. 20. 21. † Pſ. xxxiii. 8. xc. 11.

A. Jacob, on his death bed, did not heſitate to implore the protection of Angels on the two ſons of Joſeph. *The Angel*, ſays he, *that delivereth me from all evils, bleſs theſe boys.* * But it muſt be owned, that the violent propenſity of the Jews to believe in, and adore many gods, was the reaſon why God did not think it neceſſary to incline them to this devotion; and therefore we only find obſcure traces of it in the Old Teſtament. Yet theſe obſcure veſtiges have great weight with Chriſtians, who know, from other clear proofs, that this devotion is pleaſing to God.

Q. Does it appear from the New Teſtament, that we may profitably invoke the aſſiſtance of the angels?

A. St. John ſays there, to the ſeven Churches of Aſia, *Grace be unto you from the ſeven ſpirits, which are before his throne.* †

Q. May we not ſay, that by the *ſeven ſpirits*, we muſt underſtand the Holy Ghoſt, who is ſo called on account of his different gifts? ‡

A. There is not an example of ſuch an expreſſion in the whole word of God. Beſides, it does not place the Holy Ghoſt before the Throne. This is the place it uſually aſſigns to angels, to repreſent them to us as Miniſters, that are always ready to receive the orders of God, and to execute them over all the earth. § It even repreſents, in particular, ſeven principal ones in this manner, in the preſence of God. ¶ So that we cannot doubt, but that the ſeven ſpirits before the throne, are ſeven principal angels, whoſe aſſiſtance St. John deſires for the ſeven Churches of Aſia in their great afflictions.

Q. Is this all the word of God ſays reſpecting this ſubject?

A. The Angel ſaid to Toby, *I am the Angel Raphael, one of the ſeven who ſtand before the Lord,* ‖ *and offer the*

---

* Gen. xlviii. 16. † Apoc. i. 4. ‡ Iſai. xi. 2.
§ Apoc. vii. 11. ¶ Zach. iv. 10. ‖ Tob. xii. 15.

prayers of Saints. * The ſame idea is confirmed by St. John, who ſays; *Another Angel made an offering of the prayers of all Saints upon the golden altar, which is before the throne of God. And the ſmoke of the incenſe of the prayers of the Saints aſcended up before God, from the hand of the Angel.* † If the Angels offer our prayers to God, what can render it unlawful to put ſome prayers into their hands, that, as the Holy Spirit tells us, they may aſcend up from their hands to the preſence of God?

Q. We have only ſpoken of Angels: does the Scripture teach the ſame in regard of Saints?

A. The Apoſtle tells us, *That the four and twenty ancients fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the Saints.* ‡ Here the ſame may be ſaid of the Saints as of the Angels. If the Saints triumphant preſent our prayers to God, we may preſent our prayers to them, that they may aſcend up from their hands to God.

A. As the principal difficulty of Proteſtants, in this point, conſiſts in this, that they think the Saints are ignorant of our prayers, pleaſe to prove, in particular from the word of God, that they know our prayers.

A. It teaches, that even when they were here on earth, they knew many diſtant tranſactions by the Spirit of God, that dwelt in them. Eliſeus for example, as we learn from the Old Teſtament, ſaw what his ſervant Giezi did near Naaman's Chariot. § He ſaw the Syrians at a great diſtance, hidden in ambuſh againſt the King of Iſrael, and it is obſerved in general, that the Syrians ſaid to their King, *Eliſeus the Prophet telleth the King of Iſrael all the words that thou ſpeakeſt in thy privy chamber.* ¶ In the New Teſtament it appears, that St. Peter had a miraculous knowledge of Ananias

---

* Ibid. 12. † Apoc. viii. 3, 4. ‡ Apoc. v. 3.
§ 2 Kings v. 26. ¶ 2 Kings vi. 9, 12.

and Sapphira's concealed intention of deceiving him. * Why ſhould St. Peter's knowledge be more confined after his death? And why in general ſhould the Saints after their death be leſs acquainted with diſtant objects than when living?

Q. Whence do you draw this inference?

A. From this truth, that the Spirit of God, which diſcovered remote tranſactions to them when living, has not withdrawn himſelf from them ſince their death, but, on the contrary, dwells in them in all his fullneſs. For which reaſon St. Paul teaches us, that glory increaſes the knowledge of the Saints inſtead of diminiſhing it: *We know now in part, and we propheſy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part ſhall be done away.* †

Q. Continue to ſhew the lights, which you find in the Holy Scripture concerning the knowledge, which the glorified Saints have of our prayers.

A. The paſſage, which I have quoted from the Apocalypſe, is a plain proof. For as the Saints offer our prayers to God, they muſt know them. ‡ Our Lord likewiſe teaches us, that there is joy in heaven upon the converſion of a ſinner. § This converſion then muſt be known by the Saints, who are the Citizens of this heavenly Jeruſalem.

Q. Have you any other paſſage on this ſubject?

A. Our Lord expreſsly ſays, that the Saints, who by their victories have obtained the crown of glory, govern nations. This language is very different from that of Proteſtants; they cannot even bear to hear it from the mouth of Catholics. Yet they muſt bear to hear it from our Lord's. *He that ſhall overcome*, ſays he, *and keep my works unto the end, I will give him power over the nations, and he ſhall rule them with a rod of iron, and as*

---

* Acts v. 3. † 1 Cor. xii. 9, 10.
‡ Apoc. v. 8. § Luke xv. 7.

the veſſel of a potter they ſhall be broken, even as I received from my father. * Can one have power over men on the earth without any knowledge of any thing they may ſay? Can one govern people without knowing what they do? Can a glory, conformable to our Lord's, in regard of this power over nations be joined with a total ignorance of the tranſactions of this world?

Q. How can the Saints do good or ill to the nations which they govern?

A. As they know the prayers of the faithful, who expoſe to them in particular the afflictions of the Church, they beſeech God in the name of Jeſus Chriſt; and as their prayers are perfect, † they are more efficacious than thoſe they offered on earth; ſo that they draw down God's bleſſing upon the faithful, and chaſtiſements upon their enemies.

Q. Have you any other paſſage relative to the knowledge of the Saints?

A. One may produce that, which ſays they ſhall be as Angels.

Q. This paſſage means only that they ſhall reſemble them in the ſpirituality of their ſtate, in which they neither ſhall marry, nor be given in marriage, nor ſuffer any evil; in their confirmation in grace without any fear of change; and in the great glory they will enjoy, in which, like the angels, they will always behold the face of God.

A. It is from the Holy Scripture itſelf we learn, that one point of this reſemblance is the knowledge of ſome things that happen on earth, as I have ſhewn from the paſſages juſt quoted.

Q. Prove by a ſhort recapitulation of theſe paſſages, this conformity, which the glorified Saints bear to the angels in regard of knowledge.

A. As the Holy Scripture ſays, that the angels rejoice

---

* Apoc. ii 26. † Jam. v. 16. 17.

upon one ſinner doing penance, it ſays in regard of the Saints, that there is joy in heaven upon one ſinner, that is converted. * As the Holy Scripture teaches, that prayers aſcended up before God from the hand of the Angel, it likewiſe teaches, that the four and twenty ancients offered to God vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the Saints, according to the explanation of the Holy Ghoſt. † In ſhort, as the word of God informs us, that he makes uſe of the miniſtry of Angels in the government of mankind; ‡ it likewiſe informs us, that when the Saints have overcome, God gives them power over nations, to rule them and even to break them as a potter breaks his veſſels.

Q. Have you any thing more to add, concerning this knowledge of the Saints?

A. I ſay, moreover, that as the Saints in glory are, according to the Holy Scripture, pure Spirits, and conſequently in the ſame ſtate with the Angels, they have not their knowledge by the aſſiſtance of any material thing, as by the motion of the air, and by the organs of the body, but by divine revelation; one cannot conceive why diſtance of place ſhould prevent their hearing. So that they, who look on this remoteneſs of place as an obſtacle to their knowledge, cannot be ſaid to have entered deeply into the manner, in which pure Spirits know external tranſactions.

Q. Can one aſk any favors of God, through the merits of the Saints?

A. One may beg his favors by all the different ways, according to which his word informs us that he grants them. Now it frequently aſſerts, that God is bountiful to men, in conſideration of the faithful deceaſed: *I will multiply thy ſeed*, ſays God to Iſaac, *like the ſtars of heaven; and I will give to thy poſterity all theſe countries, becauſe Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my command-*

* Luke xv. 7, 10. † Apoc. v. 8. viii. 4. ‡ Heb. i. 14.

ments. * In the book of Exodus, God promiſes to ſhew mercy unto thouſands deſcended from thoſe that love him. † *The goodneſs of our Lord*, ſays David, *is unto children's children of them that keep his commandments.* ‡ And it is expreſsly noted, in the hiſtory of David's poſterity, that God bleſſed them for the ſake of David their father, becauſe he had done that which was right, and had not turned aſide from his commandments. § Theſe are what the Catholic Church calls bleſſings of God, granted through the merits of the Saints.

Q. What do you anſwer to the objection againſt the invocation of Saints, which Proteſtants draw from the ſilence of the new Teſtament on this ſubject?

A. Though this ſilence were real, it ought not to cauſe any difficulty, becauſe we ſpeak of recourſe to the prayers of Saints, not as of a thing abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, but only as of a thing that is helpful, and that may be profitable; ſo that it is not neceſſary to produce expreſs paſſages. But I muſt ſay, this ſilence is but imaginary; ſince the Holy Scripture ſpeaks as clearly of recourſe to the interceſſion of Saints, as it does of the ſubſtitution of the Sunday for the Sabbath, and of the baptiſm of infants. It evidently lays down all the principles of it; for what it ſays concerning the recourſe of the faithful on earth, to the prayers of their brethren, ſhews that God is pleaſed when we give a value to our prayers by joining thoſe of others to them. And what it ſays concerning the knowledge, which the Saints have of many things here on earth, points out to us that they are of the number of thoſe brethren, whoſe prayers we may deſire. One cannot ſhew any thing clearer in the word of God on the baptiſm of infants, or the inſtitution of Sunday.

Q. There are ſeveral things in the Holy Scripture

---

* Gen. xxvi. 4, 5. † Exod. xx. 6.
‡ Pſ. cii. 18. § 1 Kings xv. 4, 5.

ontrary to this invocation of Saints, as the paſſage in which God ſays, *I will not give my glory to another ;* * for is not praying to the Saints, giving to the creature the honor due to the Creator?

A, The prayers we addreſs to the Saints, are ſo far from giving them the honor due to God, that we cannot preſent them to him without a crime; for in theſe prayers we deſire them to pray for us. Now it would be impious to offer ſuch prayers to God, becauſe it would include a ſuppoſition that there was a being ſuperior to him.

Q. There are then different kinds of prayers?

A. Yes, there is one ſo peculiarly belonging to the Creator, that it cannot, without idolatry, be directed to a creature. It is that, in which we look on the Being we pray to as a ſovereign Being, who can himſelf beſtow the favors we apply for. St. Paul ſpoke of this kind of prayer, when he ſaid, *How ſhall they call on him, in whom they have not believed.* † But there is another kind of prayer ſo peculiar to creatures, that it would be impious to addreſs it to the Creator. It is that in which we look on the being we pray to, as an inferior being, as a creature incapable of itſelf to grant our requeſts, but as able to obtain them by its prayers. That which St. Paul often made uſe of to excite the faithful to pray for him was of this kind, ‡ as likewiſe that by which Job's friends induced him to invoke God for them, according to the expreſs command they had received from God. § The prayers which Catholics addreſs to the Angels and Saints, are likewiſe of this kind. So that it is aſtoniſhing any one can object, that by this kind of prayer we give to a creature the honor due to the Creator.

---

* Iſ. xlviii. 11. † Rom. x. 14.

‡ Rom. xv. 30. Ep. vi. 19. Col. iv. 3. 1 Theſ. v. 2. 2 Theſ. iii. 1. Heb. xiii. 18. § Job. xlii. 8.

Q. Do not they give them the glory due unto God, who believe that notwithſtanding their diſtance they hear the prayers of men, which is a kind of infinite knowledge?

A. The opinion, that is held in this regard concerning the Saints, has ſtill ſo little in it of the homage due to God, that it would be blaſphemy to maintain the ſame of God. We believe that the Saints know many diſtant things, but we do not imagine they know them all. Is this the honor we ſhould give to God? We believe in regard of the things they do know, that they have not this knowledge from themſelves, but from divine revelation. Is this the honor due to God? It is evident the Church does not in this transfer to them the honor due to God, ſince the Scripture attributes the ſame to his ſervants, whom it repreſents as endowed by the ſpirit of God with the knowledge of remote things, as diſcerning ſpirits, as diſpenſers of health and ſickneſs, of the life and death of other men, and even as having authority over the devils themſelves, by the power, which God communicates to them.

Q. If you do not give to the Saints God's honor, you give them the honor due to Jeſus Chriſt; for we deſire Jeſus Chriſt to intercede for us, which honor Catholics, as they own themſelves, give to the Saints.

A. I reply again, that the honor we give to the Saints, is ſo far from being the honor due to Jeſus Chriſt, that we cannot innocently give the ſame honor to Jeſus Chriſt. We deſire the Saints to pray to God for us, not in their own name, but in the name of Jeſus Chriſt, by the merits of his blood, without which their prayers would appear to us unavailing. Now would it not be a heinous offence to aſk our Saviour to pray for us, not in his own name, but in the name of another, and to apply to any merits but his own, as if he could not otherwiſe obtain any thing for us?

Q. Proteſtants endeavour to prove that Catholics give to the Saints the honor, that is due to God and Jeſus

Chriſt, becauſe they give them the title of Saviour, which belongs to Jeſus Chriſt; becauſe they often addreſs them as if they themſelves were to confer the favors they aſk for; and that they even ſeem on ſome occaſions to rank them above Jeſus Chriſt, as when they deſire the Virgin to command him by the right, which a mother poſſeſſes over her ſon: *Jure matris impera.*

A. The Catholic Church does not vindicate exceſſes on this ſubject, that may occur in the expreſſions of private perſons, who are at leaſt chargeable with imprudence. But as ſome of theſe ideas, that are ſo diſpleaſing to Proteſtants, may be met with in the public offices, we muſt obſerve that theſe expreſſions ſhould always be reduced to, and determined by the doctrine of the Church, which is, that it is profitable to deſire the ſaints to pray to God for us in the name of Jeſus Chriſt; in the ſame manner that we always reduce to the analogy of faith the expreſſions of the Holy Scripture, whatever appearance of contrariety may ſhew itſelf in them. Thus the number of expreſſions in the Holy Scripture, that repreſent God as having a body, raiſe no difficulty, becauſe we explain them according to the idea, which we have of God as an immaterial being.

Q. What do you think of thoſe, who calumniate the Church on this ſubject or on others, by affixing ſuch interpretations to its expreſſions as it abhors?

A. They commit an injuſtice, which the Jews were often guilty of againſt our Lord. When he ſaid, ſpeaking of an everlaſting death, *If any man keep my word, he ſhall not ſee death for ever,* * the Jews explained his diſcourſe of a temporal death, and, without aſking in what ſenſe he ought to be underſtood, they precipitately took occaſion from the miſtaken notion, which they had conceived, to vent the moſt horrid outrages againſt him: *Now we know,* ſaid they, *that thou haſt*

* John viii. 51.

a devil. Abraham is dead, and the prophets, and thou ſayeſt, if any man keep my word, he ſhall not taſte death for ever. * This was likewiſe the ſin of the falſe witneſſes, produced in order to bring about our Lord's condemnation. He ſaid, *I am able to deſtroy the temple of God, and after three days to rebuild it.* † It is true that Jeſus Chriſt had pronounced theſe words, which ſeemed, as the Jews pretended, to relate to the temple of Jeruſalem: but our Lord did not ſpeak theſe words with a view to it; for he only meant them of his body, which might likewiſe be called a temple. If the minds of the Jews had not been prejudiced with a ſpirit of calumny, they would, before they condemned him, have aſked whether or no, when he ſpoke thoſe words, he intended to apply them to the temple of Jeruſalem. In the ſame ſpirit, they accuſed our Lord of an intention of forming deſigns againſt the authority of Cæſar, becauſe he called himſelf Chriſt the King. ‡

Q. Is there any part in the Holy Scripture, that may ſerve to put Proteſtants in mind, that they ought to aſk the Church for the explanation of the expreſſions and ceremonies, that give them offence, and that they ought readily to admit the favorable interpretations it lays before them in order to elucidate them?

A. There is a very remarkable example on this ſubject, in the conduct of the people of Iſrael, with regard to the two tribes and the half, who had built an altar different from that of the tabernacle, when they returned to their own country. § The Iſraelites, far from paſſing immediate ſentence on the two tribes, ſhewed a readineſs to lay aſide the impreſſion, which the erection of ſuch an altar might juſtly have cauſed in them. They ſent to them deputies of diſtinction, to inquire into the reaſon of this conduct, and the two

---

* Ibid. 52. † Matt. xxvi. 61. ‡ Luke xxiii. 1. § Joſ. xxii. 13.

tribes and the half having anſwered them, that they deteſted the idolatry, of which they had ſuſpected them, that they adored only the God of Iſrael, to whom they ſacrificed in the tabernacle, and that the altar, which raiſed their complaints, was only a memorial deſigned to inſtruct poſterity, that, notwithſtanding the ſeparation of the Jordan, they were ſtill a part of God's people, the Deputies of the people of Iſrael did not endeavour to enforce their ſuſpicions; they did not tell them there were other ways of ſhewing the union of the two tribes and the half with the people of God, and that it was ſufficiently pointed out by their ſubmiſſion to the ſame conductors, by their conformity to the ſame civil and religious cuſtoms, by their triple attendance at the tabernacle on the great feſtivals, &c. They were inſtantly ſatisfied with the anſwer of their brethren. They admitted it moſt willingly, ſays the Scripture; and they did not compel the two tribes and the half to deſtroy this altar, of the erection of which they had given ſo favorable an explanation. Proteſtants ought to obſerve the ſame method in regard of the Catholic Church, when they find among us ceremonies or expreſſions, that ſeem to them to leave room to ſuſpect us of idolatry; they ought to inquire, whether the Church uſes them in the wicked ſenſe they ſuſpect; and if the Church abhors this meaning and gives a contrary explanation, they ought to admit this favorable expoſition, be no more ſcandalized at theſe expreſſions and ceremonies, nor any more offended, if they continue to be practiſed. Thus they ought to act in particular in regard of thoſe expreſſions and practices, that have given occaſion to Proteſtants to believe, that we give to Saints an honor that is due to God alone.

Q. Does the Holy Scripture furniſh any examples, that may aſſiſt you in ſupporting the propriety of the titles you ſometimes beſtow upon the Saints?

A. Joſhua bore the name of Saviour; for this is the

meaning of the name *Joſhua*. This ſame title of Saviour is given in the Holy Scripture to one of the judges of the Iſraelites.* Joſeph likewiſe allowed Pharao to give him an Egyptian name that ſignifies *Saviour of the world.*† Kings are ſeveral times called Gods in the ſacred writings, and Daniel made no difficulty of giving Nabucodonoſor the title of *King of Kings.*‡ Thus it is manifeſt, that it is then only blaſphemy to give to creatures ſome title of Jeſus Chriſt, when it is given them in the ſame ſenſe, that agrees to Jeſus Chriſt; which no one can with the leaſt appearance of truth accuſe us of in regard of the Saints. The Holy Scripture makes no difficulty of ſaying, that the Martyrs are appointed over nations, that they govern them, and that they can break them as a potter breaks his veſſels. Thoſe expreſſions then ſhould not abſolutely be condemned, in which we aſk favors of the Saints; but they ſhould be explained by the efficacy attributed to their prayers. In ſhort the Holy Scripture calls Jacob *ſtrong againſt God.*§ It repreſents God ſaying to Moſes, *Let me alone*, as if a man could hinder God from acting.‖ It ſays, ſpeaking of Joſhua, *that God obeyed the voice of a man.*¶ Expreſſions of this kind ſhould not then be abſolutely condemned, but they ſhould be explained and underſtood of the power, which God's mercy gives to the humility and prayers of his faithful ſervants; yet great care ſhould be taken not to uſe this kind of expreſſions, when we ſpeak to ſuch as are not ſufficiently well diſpoſed to reduce them to their real meaning.

Q. The invocation of Saints then does not imply any thing contrary to the glory of God, and that of Jeſus Chriſt, ſuch as the word of God repreſents it to us?

A. No. For in this ſacred word, we behold God as

---

* Judges iii. 15. † Gen. xli. 45. ‡ Dan. ii. 37.
§ Gen. xxxii. 28. ‖ Ex. xxii. 10. ¶ Joſ. x. 14.

the only one ſeated on the Throne, the only ſovereign, and the only one that can confer grace; but all intelligent creatures in heaven and on earth, are there conſidered as a mere nothing in his preſence, as all ſtanding in need of his mercy and goodneſs, and as in a ſtate of adoration before him. Meanwhile ſome that are ſtill ſubject to many miſeries, intreat the others to aſſiſt them by their prayers, which are perfect. In ſhort, in this doctrine our Lord is propoſed as the Mediator betwixt God and his creatures, through whom, of courſe, all our adorations and prayers muſt paſs, before they reach the throne of God.

Q. May it not be ſaid that the invocation of Saints, ſo far from being contrary to his glory, is honorable to him?

A. Without doubt. For we have no other intention in it than that God ſhould be honored by a greater number of homages and adorations. St. Paul animated with zeal for this glory, wiſhed to have the prayers of others joined to his prayers. He deſired them to pray for him; and when by pious multiplication of prayers he had obtained his petitions, he again begged that God might in like manner be thanked by a holy multiplication of praiſes. In the ſame manner and with a view to God's glory, Catholics, who know that their prayers and homages are imperfect, endeavour to effect, that petitions ſhould be put up to him, and praiſes given for them by many of the other faithful, and particularly by the Saints, whoſe prayers and praiſes are perfect.

Q. What do you anſwer to the paſſage where it is ſaid, *Come to me all you that are heavy laden:* * *I am the way, the truth, and the life.* † *There is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we muſt be ſaved, but that of*

* Matt. xi. 28. † John xiv. 6.

*Jeſus.** *There is one Mediator.*† *If any man ſin we have an advocate, Jeſus Chriſt?*‡

A. All theſe paſſages are foreign to this ſubject, becauſe they only prove that our Lord is the true Meſſiah, who alone made atonement for our ſins.

Q. Explain theſe paſſages more at length.

A. Jeſus Chriſt ſays *Come to me*, but he does not ſay, do not come to any but me; which would have included a condemnation of prayers addreſſed to the Father and the Holy Ghoſt. I obſerve in particular of this paſſage, that it does not even relate to prayer; for theſe words, *Come to me*, only ſignify *become my Diſciples*; and our Lord immediately explains them; *learn of me*, adds he, *becauſe I am meek, and take up my yoke upon you.*

Q. Say likewiſe ſomething of the other paſſages.

A. *I am the way, the truth, and the life. No man cometh to the Father but by me. There is no other name given to men whereby we muſt be ſaved, but that of Jeſus. There is one Mediator.* All theſe paſſages only mean, that our Lord is the only Meſſiah, the only one through whoſe merits we can be pleaſing to God, the only one, who by his blood has opened for us the way to the throne of God. The ſame is the meaning of that paſſage, where it is ſaid, *If any man ſin, we have*, &c. St. John obſerves immediately after, that this quality relates to the blood of Jeſus Chriſt, by which all our ſins are expiated. *For*, he adds, *he is the propitiation for our ſins.* In all this there is nothing contrary to the invocation of Saints; for we do not believe they have power to grant us the remiſſion of ſins through their blood, nor can they of themſelves, and without the merits of Jeſus Chriſt, make us acceptable to God.

Q. Have you not ſome other proper obſervation on all theſe paſſages?

A. The Holy Scripture teaches us, that all theſe paſ-

---

* Acts iv. 12. † 1 Tim. ii. 5. ‡ 1 John ii. 1.

ſages, as likewiſe all the conſiderations of God's glory, and that of Jeſus Chriſt, which we are charged with giving to creatures, are no argument why we may not aſk other creatures to pray to God for us. For notwithſtanding all theſe things, the Holy Spirit inſpired St. Paul frequently to aſk the faithful to pray to God for the ſucceſs of his miniſtry. Beſides, they do not prevent the Church triumphant from praying for the militant.

Q. Notwithſtanding all you have ſaid, the Angel that appeared to St. John would not allow him to proſtrate himſelf before him. *

A. There muſt have been ſome other reaſon different from that, which regards the invocation of Saints. Proteſtants themſelves could not be diſpleaſed, if, on the apparition of an Angel, one ſhould honor him with a profound ſalutation. There are ſeveral parts of the Holy Scripture, in which it is related, that men ſaluted other men by proſtrating themſelves before them; and the Saints whoſe examples are recorded in it, did not prohibit thoſe who honored them in this manner, from proſtrating themſelves before them. Thus Elias permitted the holy man Abdias, the governor of king Achab's houſe, to proſtrate himſelf before him; he likewiſe allowed another captain to fall on his knees before him to beſeech him. † Abraham and Lot likewiſe proſtrated themſelves before the Angels that appeared to them, yet the Angels did not reject the honor paid them by the Patriarchs. ‡

Q. Why then did the Angel, whom St. John ſaw, diſapprove of this Apoſtle's proſtration before him, ſince Abraham and Lot had proſtrated themſelves before other Angels, who had not found fault with them for this action?

---

* Apoc. xix. 10. † 1 Kings xviii. 7. 2 Kings i. 13.
‡ Gen. xviii. 2. xix. 1.

A. One may aſſign two reaſons for it.

Q. Which is the firſt?

A. If the word *to adore* is to be taken in a ſtrict ſenſe, when it is ſaid, that St. John proſtrated to adore, this Apoſtle believed from the ſplendor of the apparition, that it was Jeſus Chriſt himſelf, and that this was a ſymbol of the miraculous preſence of God, ſimilar to that of the burning buſh and the fire of Mount Sinai; for St. John never could have adored an angel as ſuch, and ſtill much leſs would he have fallen a ſecond time into the ſame idolatry. * This paſſage, when taken in this ſenſe, ſhews we ought not to give any honor to an Angel, by looking on him as God. But as to us, whatever honor we give to Angels, we conſider them as ſervants and friends of God, who have it in their power to pray for us.

Q. Which is the ſecond reaſon, that might have made the angel decline this homage of St. John?

A. By taking the word to adore for a profound reverence, as when it is ſaid, that an *Amalekite fell upon his face, and adored David*, the Holy Ghoſt intended to tell us, that on St. John's proſtrating himſelf ſo low before the Angel, the heavenly meſſenger repreſented to him, that as they both had the ſame commiſſion, he ſhould not ſalute him with ſo great humility; for as they were companions in the ſame work, and in ſo great a work, they only ought to humble themſelves in that manner before God. For which reaſon, the Angel in accounting for this action ſays, *I am thy fellow-ſervant, and of thy brethren, who have the teſtimony of Jeſus*; and he adds, *the ſpirit of prophecy is the teſtimony of Jeſus*, to ſhew that the ſpirit of prophecy, with which St. John was filled, being an extraordinary appointment to give teſtimony of Jeſus Chriſt, equalled him to the Angels, whoſe moſt honorable employment is to ſerve our Lord.

* Apoc. xxii, 8.

For which cauſe the Angels, as mentioned in the Old Teſtament, did not heſitate to receive from ſeveral perſons, ſuch as Abraham, Lot, and the Prophet Balaam, what they appear to have refuſed from the Apoſtles in the New.

Q. There is a paſſage in St. Paul, that expreſsly condemns the ſervice of the Angels: *Let no man*, ſays he, *ſeduce you, willing in humility, and religion of Angels.* *

A. This term, *of ſervice or religion of Angels*, is totally equivocal; for the Moſaic law might have been called thus, which ſeveral teachers endeavoured to renew in the Church, becauſe, as St. Paul ſays, the law was given by the miniſtry of Angels. And as the original word ſignifies not only the worſhip of Angels, but likewiſe a ſuperſtitious worſhip of Angels, magic may be meant here, which is practiſed by means of wicked Angels, a fondneſs for which the Gnoſtics, impious Heretics of thoſe times, endeavoured to inſtil into the Chriſtians. This paſſage underſtood either of theſe ways proves nothing againſt the invocation of Saints, ſuch as is practiſed in the Church.

Q. Do you know any other more probable meaning of this paſſage?

A. There is greater appearance, that St. Paul had in view ſome ancient Heretics, whoſe religion was a mixture of Judaiſm and Paganiſm. They revived the legal ceremonies; but at the ſame time taught that God was a ſupreme ſovereign, too high to be addreſſed by ſo mean a being as man; that betwixt this infinite Being and men there were intervening ſpirits; and that all worſhip was to be paid by mankind to theſe Angels, as they brought to them all the favors of God. They invented a thouſand fabulous ſtories concerning theſe Angels, and particularly relating to their different generations, and by theſe means diverted Chriſtians from the ſervice

* Col. ii. 18.

of God, and all recourſe to Jeſus Chriſt the true Mediator.

Q. In order to ſhew that this paſſage to the Coloſſians is foreign to the point in queſtion, explain the difference betwixt the Heretics alluded to in this paſſage, and the Catholics.

A. Catholics have no affinity with ſuch perverſe Heretics. We do not mean that the humility of men ſhould deter them from addreſſing themſelves to God, and neceſſarily make them pray to Angels, ſo as to give them all the worſhip due to the divinity: on the contrary, we believe that every Chriſtian is bound under pain of eternal damnation, to pray to God and have recourſe to Jeſus Chriſt; that it is only profitable to apply to Angels and to Saints; and that, when we addreſs ourſelves to them, we ought to be careful not to give them any honor, which God has reſerved to himſelf, and ſhould only beg the aſſiſtance of their prayers.

Q. How do you know that St. Paul intended to attack theſe Heretics?

A. His deſign ſhews itſelf in the very paſſage. For as theſe Heretics had drawn this theology from the ſchool of Plato, St. Paul ſays, in the former part of the chapter, *Beware leſt any man impoſe upon you by philoſophy, and vain deceit; according to the tradition of men, according to the rudiments of the world** As they intermixed the reaſonings and ceremonies of the Jews with their hereſy, St. Paul previouſly condemns theſe things,† and afterwards, as theſe Heretics wanted, under the pretext of humility, to perſuade men, inſtead of applying to God himſelf, to apply to the Angels as Mediators; St. Paul ſays, *let no man ſeduce you by humility.* As they broached many fables concerning the genealogy of Angels, he elſewhere forbids contentions without end about genealogies, and he ſays here, *that theſe perſons wanted to*

* Ibid. 8

† Ibid. 16. 17. 21.

penetrate into things they had not ſeen, being puffed up with pride. * Laſtly, as they by theſe means deterred men from following Jeſus Chriſt and the doctrine of the Church, St. Paul proves to them that all true ſcience is in Jeſus Chriſt, and that we have received all God's graces through him,† and reproaches them for deſerting the head, *from which all the body, which is the Church, being ſupplied with nouriſhment and compacted, groweth, and increaſeth.* ‡

Q. Proteſtants object a paſſage concerning the Saints, of the ſame kind as that of the Apocalypſe concerning the Angels. And to ſhew that the Scripture condemns the honor you give them, they remark that Cornelius having proſtrated himſelf before St. Peter, this Apoſtle would not allow it, and ſaid to him, *Ariſe, I myſelf alſo am a man.* §

A. I ſhall likewiſe anſwer in the ſame manner. Would they prove from hence, that one cannot lawfully proſtrate oneſelf before any creature? This would imply a condemnation of the Holy Ghoſt, who does not condemn Abraham when he proſtrated himſelf before the Hetheans; nor Jacob when he proſtrated himſelf before Eſau; nor Solomon when he proſtrated himſelf before Berſabee, and many other ſuch examples that are mentioned in the Holy Scripture. ‖ Do they ſuppoſe that St. Peter would not allow Cornelius to aſk to be made a partaker of his prayers? Yet we find that this Apoſtle in another place did not condemn Simon, who ſaid to him, pray for me to the Lord. ¶ Thus I cannot find how this paſſage is contrary to the practice of humbling ourſelves before the Saints to deſire them to pray to God for us.

Q. How do you explain this paſſage?

---

* 1. Tim. i. 4. Tit. iii. 3. Col. ii. 18.
† Ibid. 10. 15. ‡ Ibid. 19. § Acts x. 26.
‖ Gen. xxiii. 7. xxxiii. 3. 1 Kings ii. 19. ¶ Acts viii. 24.

of God, and all recourſe to Jeſus Chriſt the true Mediator.

Q. In order to ſhew that this paſſage to the Coloſſians is foreign to the point in queſtion, explain the difference betwixt the Heretics alluded to in this paſſage, and the Catholics.

A. Catholics have no affinity with ſuch perverſe Heretics. We do not mean that the humility of men ſhould deter them from addreſſing themſelves to God, and neceſſarily make them pray to Angels, ſo as to give them all the worſhip due to the divinity: on the contrary, we believe that every Chriſtian is bound under pain of eternal damnation, to pray to God and have recourſe to Jeſus Chriſt; that it is only profitable to apply to Angels and to Saints; and that, when we addreſs ourſelves to them, we ought to be careful not to give them any honor, which God has reſerved to himſelf, and ſhould only beg the aſſiſtance of their prayers.

Q. How do you know that St. Paul intended to attack theſe Heretics?

A. His deſign ſhews itſelf in the very paſſage. For as theſe Heretics had drawn this theology from the ſchool of Plato, St. Paul ſays, in the former part of the chapter, *Beware leſt any man impoſe upon you by philoſophy, and vain deceit; according to the tradition of men, according to the rudiments of the world** As they intermixed the reaſonings and ceremonies of the Jews with their hereſy, St. Paul previouſly condemns theſe things, † and afterwards, as theſe Heretics wanted, under the pretext of humility, to perſuade men, inſtead of applying to God himſelf, to apply to the Angels as Mediators; St. Paul ſays, *let no man ſeduce you by humility.* As they broached many fables concerning the genealogy of Angels, he elſewhere forbids contentions without end about genealogies, and he ſays here, *that theſe perſons wanted to*

* Ibid. 8 † Ibid. 16. 17. 21.

*penetrate into things they had not ſeen, being puffed up with pride.** Laſtly, as they by theſe means deterred men from following Jeſus Chriſt and the doctrine of the Church, St. Paul proves to them that all true ſcience is in Jeſus Chriſt, and that we have received all God's graces through him,† and reproaches them for deſerting the head, *from which all the body, which is the Church, being ſupplied with nouriſhment and compacted, groweth, and increaſeth.* ‡

Q. Proteſtants object a paſſage concerning the Saints, of the ſame kind as that of the Apocalypſe concerning the Angels. And to ſhew that the Scripture condemns the honor you give them, they remark that Cornelius having proſtrated himſelf before St. Peter, this Apoſtle would not allow it, and ſaid to him, *Ariſe, I myſelf alſo am a man.* §

A. I ſhall likewiſe anſwer in the ſame manner. Would they prove from hence, that one cannot lawfully proſtrate oneſelf before any creature? This would imply a condemnation of the Holy Ghoſt, who does not condemn Abraham when he proſtrated himſelf before the Hetheans; nor Jacob when he proſtrated himſelf before Eſau; nor Solomon when he proſtrated himſelf before Berſabee, and many other ſuch examples that are mentioned in the Holy Scripture. ‖ Do they ſuppoſe that St. Peter would not allow Cornelius to aſk to be made a partaker of his prayers? Yet we find that this Apoſtle in another place did not condemn Simon, who ſaid to him, pray for me to the Lord. ¶ Thus I cannot find how this paſſage is contrary to the practice of humbling ourſelves before the Saints to deſire them to pray to God for us.

Q. How do you explain this paſſage?

---

* 1. Tim. i. 4. Tit. iii. 3. Col. ii. 18.
† Ibid. 10. 15. ‡ Ibid. 19. § Acts x. 26.
‖ Gen. xxiii. 7. xxxiii. 3. 1 Kings ii. 19. ¶ Acts viii. 24.

A. I conſider it in the ſame manner as that of the Apocalypſe concerning the Angel adored by St. John, either as a mark of illuſion in Cornelius, who wanted to give St. Peter the adoration due to the Divinity; or rather as Cornelius was not an idolater, as were the inhabitants of Lyſtra, I look on this paſſage as a proof of St. Peter's humility, who being unwilling to ſuffer a Roman officer, diſtinguiſhed by his rank and eminent piety, to fall down before him, choſe by theſe humble words to decline his homage.

Q. Proteſtants ſay that the invocation of Saints makes us reſemble the Pagans, of whom the Holy Scripture ſpeaks, who beſide one Sovereign God, whom they called Moloch, or Baal, or Jupiter, that is to ſay, King, Lord, Father, or by ſome other ſimilar name, had other inferior Gods. Some of them add, that this is what St. Paul meant to foretel, when he ſaid, *that ſome ſhall depart from the faith, giving heed to doctrines of devils*, * that is to ſay, according to them, to doctrines concerning the divinities, which the Pagans called Demons, and to articles, which renew the worſhip, that Pagans gave to their inferior Gods. What do you ſay of this objection?

A. I ſay, that nothing can be more ſhocking than objections, which tend to prove that the whole Church is fallen into idolatry; becauſe our Lord has ſaid, and hath inſpired others frequently to ſay the ſame, that this never would happen.

Q. What do you remark in particular concerning this wild notion of ſome of the Reformers?

A. It is true, that the Pagans meant their Demi-Gods by the word demons; ſo we find that the Athenians who were idolaters, underſtood it in this ſenſe in the 17th chap. of the Acts. † But it never ſignified any thing of the kind in the mouth of the ſacred writers, who, by the word demons always meant thoſe wicked

* 1 Tim. iv. 1. † Acts. xvii. 18.

ſpirits, that ſolicit men to ſin in order to involve them with themſelves in eternal miſery.

Q. Continue to refute the objection drawn from thoſe words of the Apoſtle, *giving heed to doctrines of devils.*

A. I add that it is moſt aſtoniſhing that Chriſtians can pretend to find any compariſon betwixt Pagans, that knew not God, and Catholics, who adore God the Creator of heaven and earth. For the Pagans worſhipped devils, and wicked men, whom, after their death, they ranked among the inferior gods; and Catholics honor the Apoſtles and Martyrs of Jeſus Chriſt. The Pagans offered ſacrifices to theſe inferior Gods, and attributed to them power and knowledge independent of the Sovereign God: Catholics on the contrary, refuſe to offer ſacrifice to any other but God alone, whilſt they attribute to the ſaints no other knowledge or power than what they receive from God. It is then an enormous crime to make this kind of compariſon, and to preſume even to ſupport it by the Holy Scripture, and that too by giving ſuch explanations of it as were never heard of before this age.

Q. The greateſt difficulty, which the moſt reaſonable Proteſtants have on this ſubject, is that they ſeem to find in the Holy Scripture, that the Saints do not hear our prayers, and on this account the invocation of ſaints appears to them at leaſt unprofitable, as would be the diſcourſe of a perſon, who ſhould ſpeak to one of his friends, who was at Jeruſalem as if he were preſent, and ſhould addreſs his prayers to him, imagining without foundation that God would make them known to him.

A. I have two things to obſerve to them on that point: the firſt is, that they ought then to approve of our recurring to the prayers of the angels, of whoſe preſence they cannot have any doubt: the ſecond is, that I have proved the knowledge of the Saints in glory, from the

Holy Scripture; and when we add to these passages the belief of the universal Church, to which the Scripture refers us, it is manifest there is proof sufficient to shew the utility of the invocation of Saints. We may likewise remark, that to establish this utility, it is not necessary to demonstrate the reality of their knowledge. We have, indeed, many reasons to believe, that the Saints can hear our prayers; and when we pray to them in this supposition, though even they should not hear us, God would hear us, and would, without doubt, approve of our piety; inasmuch as not being satisfied with our own prayers, which we address to him, we desire that the faithful, who enjoy his glory, should also pray to him in our favor.

Q. Answer expressly to those passages of the Holy Scripture, in which Protestants think they plainly discover that the Saints do not hear our prayers. Job says of the dead, *Thou hast strengthened him for a little while, that he may pass away for ever: thou shalt change his face, and shalt send him away. Whether his children come to honor or dishonor, he shall not understand.* *

A. Job speaks there only of the bodies of the dead, which cannot see what befalls their children. The Holy Scripture frequently says in this sense, that men do not praise God when they are descended into the grave; that is to say, that their bodies praise him no more. Though Job should speak of the dead with regard to their souls, we should say that, speaking of the dead in general, he only considers them with relation to their natural knowledge; and in this sense we may say, that the dead know nothing of what happens on earth. We may moreover say, that in several parts of the Holy Scripture, the knowledge of things signifies the love and attachment one has for them; and the bare perusal of this passage seems to favor this explanation. *His*

* Job xiv. 20, 21.

children, ſays Job, *ſhall come to diſhonor, and he ſhall not underſtand.* And in one of the ſubſequent chapters, *what is it to him what befalleth his houſe after him: and if the number of his months be diminiſhed by one half?* * In ſhort, though this paſſage ſhould be reſtrained only to their knowledge, we ſay that the Saints do not know every thing, but only ſuch as God pleaſes to reveal to them. Now without any prejudice to this article we may admit the temporal ſtate of their children into the number of things they do not know. Thus, in whatever manner we conſider this paſſage, it is not contrary to the knowledge, which the Saints have of our prayers.

Q. There is another paſſage in Eccleſiaſtes, which appears to them of more weight againſt this knowledge. *The dead*, ſays the wiſe man, *know nothing more, neither have they any part in this world, and in the work that is done under the ſun.*†

A. If we read the whole paſſage, we ſhall plainly perceive that it contains no proof on this ſubject. It is as follows: *The dead know nothing more, neither have they a reward any more: for the memory of them is forgotten: their love alſo, and their hatred are all periſhed, neither have they any part in all that is done under the ſun.* It is evident this is not to be underſtood of the Saints. We cannot ſay that they know nothing; for St. Paul ſays, *they ſhall know fully.*‡ We cannot ſay they have no reward, or as it is in the Hebrew, that there is no recompence for them; *for they enjoy a crown of life.*§ *Death is gain to them.*¶ It cannot be ſaid their memory is forgotten: David tells us, *the juſt ſhall be in everlaſting remembrance:*‖ nor can we ſay their love and hatred have periſhed; for they always love God, and hate ſin, *charity never falleth away.*** We cannot ſay they take no part in all that is done under the

* Job xxi. 21. † Eccl. ix. 5, 6. ‡ 1 Cor. xiii. 12.
§ Apoc. ii. 10. ¶ Phil. i. 21. ‖ Pſ. xci. 7.
** 1 Cor. xiii. 8.

ſun; for they commonly take a part in the good or ill, that befalls the Church. And St. John ſays, *they offer to God the prayers of the Saints on earth.* *

Q. Though we ſhould apply this paſſage to the Saints, would it prove their ignorance of our prayers?

A. No. For the wiſe man ſpeaks only of an attachment to the things of the earth, that remains no more after death. He only teaches, that the part, which men take in earthly pleaſures laſts but while they live; that after death they are neither pleaſed with nor enjoy any of theſe things; that the companions of their pleaſures think no more of them; that they neither have love nor averſion for any of theſe worldly objects, and in a word, that they take no longer any part in all that is done under the ſun. This manifeſtly relates, not to all things in general, but to the pleaſures of the world; not to the bare knowledge, but to the attachment and pleaſure that men, whilſt they live, experience in the things of the earth.

Q. Is this all you have to ſay on this paſſage?

A. Proteſtants, in their remarks on this paſſage, expreſs themſelves thus: *Some Interpreters think theſe are the words of ſuch as place their ſovereign happineſs in the enjoyment of the preſent life, and that death is the greateſt of all evils.* And they add, on the words that immediately precede thoſe you have objected: *A living dog is better than a dead lion. This is a proverbial expreſſion, frequently uſed by the Epicureans, to ſhew that all happineſs conſiſts in the enjoyment of the preſent life.* By following this explanation, we may affirm, that theſe words they have recourſe to againſt the knowledge of the Saints, are not the words of the Holy Ghoſt.

Q. Explain this more at length.

A. We may obſerve, that the wiſe man, in this book, relates different opinions of men, not to approve them,

* Apoc. viii. 3, 4

but to reject ſuch as draw the heart to ſenſual pleaſures, and to induce us to embrace that ſentiment, which grounds our happineſs on the fear of God, and the obſervation of his commandments. According to this explanation, theſe words, *The dead know nothing, &c.* are one of thoſe parts in this book, in which the Epicureans propoſe their opinion. I ſay then, if we conſider the paſſage in this view, the Holy Ghoſt himſelf does not ſpeak what is objected againſt the knowledge of the Saints; but he there introduces carnal men with their abominable opinion, that makes happineſs conſiſt in the pleaſures of this life as if all periſhed with the body. Thus the Holy Scripture only relates the words, to excite our deteſtation of them, as in other places it mentions ſome of the ſame kind. *The fool hath ſaid in his heart there is no God: let us eat and drink for to-morrow we ſhall die: Soul, eat, drink, make good cheer.* * It is ſhameful that Proteſtants ſhould deceive themſelves and the ignorant, by forming an objection to the univerſal practice of the Church in the invoking of Saints, out of the words of the Devil, which they underſtand and quote as the words of God.

Q. Explain this opinion more fully.

A. To this end I will give the paſſage more at length than I have yet done. It is ſaid in the preceding verſes: *All things equally happen to the juſt and to the wicked: as the good, ſo alſo is the ſinner: as the perjured, ſo alſo he that ſweareth truth.* † It is likewiſe ſaid, *there is no man that liveth always, or that hopeth for this. A living dog is better than a dead lion.* ‡ The words you have objected, *the dead know nothing*, &c. are to the ſame purpoſe; and when conſidered with the context, ſignify, that after death nothing remains of man, and that he has neither knowledge nor ſentiment. The concluſion that follows, is ſuited to

* Pſ. xiii. 1. 1 Cor. xv. 32. Luke xii. 19.
† Ecc. ix. 2. ‡ Ibid. 4.

theſe wicked principles of an Epicurean. *Go and eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with gladneſs: at all times let thy garment be white, and let not oil depart from thy head: live joyfully with the wife, whom thou loveſt, all the days of thy unſteady life.** In a word, the abridgment of this whole paſſage is the ſentiment of libertiniſm mentioned in another place. *Let us eat and drink, for to morrow we ſhall die.*† It is ſaid, in the ſame ſenſe, in another part of this book: *Who knoweth if the ſpirit of the children of Adam goeth upward, and if the ſpirit of the beaſts goeth downward.*‡ The wiſe man introduces the wicked, ſpeaking in the ſame ſpirit: *The time of our life is ſhort and tedious; and in the end of a man, there is no remedy; and after this we ſhall be as if we had not been: come therefore and let us enjoy the good things that are preſent*, &c. § The Holy Scripture introduces theſe diſcourſes only to raiſe our abhorrence of them. To theſe, notwithſtanding, have Proteſtants had recourſe for proofs, to overthrow a doctrine propoſed and practiſed by the whole Church, to which God has promiſed the infallible guidance of his Holy Spirit.

CHAP. XII.

Of Relics.

Q. IS it lawful to preſerve the bodies of Saints, and to tranſlate them from one place to another, inſtead of leaving them to corrupt in the ground with thoſe of the other dead?

A. Yes; upon a ſuppoſition that it is done with pious intentions. The Scripture teaches us that the Church

* Ibid. 7, 8, 9.
† Cor. xv. 32.
‡ Eccl. iii. 21.
§ Wiſ. ii. 1, 2, 6.

of Iſrael carefully preſerved the bones of Joſeph, and removed them into the land of Canaan. *

Q. Is there no ſuperſtition in believing, that God ſometimes has ſo much regard to them, as to work miracles where they are?

A. We ſee in the Old Teſtament, that God raiſed one from the dead, whoſe body had been put into the grave of the prophet Eliſeus. †

Q. Is it poſſible that God ſhould work miracles in honor, not only of the bodies of his ſervants, whom he has taken to himſelf, but even of ſeveral things which have belonged to them?

A. We are plainly told in the books of Kings, that Eliſeus ſometimes wrought miracles by means of his ſtaff, ‡ and that with the cloak which Elias left him, he divided the waters of Jordan, as Elias himſelf had once before uſed it, for the ſame purpoſe. § And St. Luke ſays in the Acts of the Apoſtles, that ſeveral ſick were healed by means of handkerchiefs, which the Apoſtles had touched, ¶ and even by cauſing themſelves to be carried where the ſhadow of St. Peter might cover them as he paſſed. ‖

Q. Is there then no ſuperſtition in believing that God makes uſe in this manner of viſible things for miraculous purpoſes?

A. The contrary appears, not only from the paſſage of the Acts, which I have quoted, but alſo from the Old Teſtament. Was it not by the rod of Moſes that God effected all thoſe wonders in Egypt, and in the deſert. ** And in the New, was it not our Lord's pleaſure that the woman with the bloody flux, and ſeveral other ſick, ſhould be healed by the touch of his garments? ††

---

* Exod. xiii. 19. Joſ. xxi. 32.
† 2 Kings xiii. 21.
‡ 2 Kings iv. 29.
§ 2 Kings ii. 8, 14.
¶ Acts xix. 12.
‖ Acts v. 15.
** Exod. iv. 17.—vii. 9, &c.
†† Matt. ix. 21.—xiv. 36.

Q. Is it lawful to ſhew any outward mark of reſpect to the relics of Saints?

A. It is, becauſe they are holy things, which excite our attention towards God; and becauſe God honors them with his particular preſence. For the Holy Scripture repreſents the faithful as ſhewing reſpect, when they have been in places diſtinguiſhed by God's particular preſence. *Put off the ſhoes from thy feet*, ſays God to Moſes, *for the place on which thou ſtandeſt is holy ground.** An Angel ſpoke in the ſame manner to Joſhua, when he had paſſed the Jordan.† And the Holy Ghoſt commands like honor to be paid to the houſe of God: *Keep thy foot when thou goeſt into the Houſe of God.* ‡

Q. What do you conclude from this?

A. I conclude, that the Holy Scripture teaches us to ſhew tokens of reſpect to holy things, and conſequently to Relics, which I have ſhewn by the ſame Scripture to be holy, not only by the appointment of the Church, in her uſe of them to excite the piety of her children, but even by that of God himſelf, in his frequent uſe of them as inſtruments of Divine miracles.

CHAP. XIII.

Of Purgatory and Prayer for the Dead.

Q. AFTER having ſpoken of the Saints who are in glory, let us ſpeak of thoſe, whom the Church believes to be in a middle ſtate, namely, neither in paradiſe, nor in hell; and who are therefore the ſubject of our prayers to God. Tell me whether it is certain, from holy writ, (as Proteſtants affirm,) that all the dead go immediately to heaven or to hell.

* Exod. iii. 5. † Joſ. v. 16. ‡ Eccl. iv. 17.

A. Quite otherwiſe: if we take Holy Scripture for our guide, we cannot doubt of there being ſome other ſtate, diſtinct from thoſe of heaven and hell. This appears in particular, in the caſe of thoſe perſons, whom our Lord raiſed from the dead during his life-time, or at the time of his death. Lazarus, for example, who had been four days dead, had been neither in heaven nor in hell; from which places the mercy and juſtice of God forbid men to return, and live again upon the earth. There is, therefore, ſome ſtate in the other world, beſides thoſe of heaven and hell.

Q. Does it appear in holy writ, that the people of God uſed to pray for the dead?

A. In order to deny this, the reformers have found themſelves under the neceſſity of cutting off a book from the Old Teſtament. For it is ſaid in the ſecond book of the Machabees, that Judas Machabeus cauſed ſacrifices to be offered at Jeruſalem for the ſoldiers, that were ſlain in a battle, *becauſe it is a holy and a wholeſome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be looſed from ſins.* *

Q. But is the prayer for the dead here ſpoken of, ſuch as is taught in the Catholic Church? Theſe ſoldiers were guilty of Idolatry, ſince after their death there were found upon them things conſecrated to idols, which they had concealed under their clothes. Now the Catholic Church never prays for thoſe, who have died in mortal ſin, ſuch as is that of idolatry.

A. It is not true that theſe ſoldiers had been guilty of idolatry; they had concealed things conſecrated to idols under their clothes, not out of attachment to the idols, but to make plunder of what had been offered to them by the heathens; this was indeed a ſin expreſsly forbidden by the law of Moſes, but it was not a mortal ſin like that of idolatry. Beſides all were not guilty of this fault; and we may reaſonably conclude, that prayer

* 2 Mach: xii. 46.

was to be made principally for thoſe, who had not yielded to the paſſion of avarice.

Q. Is prayer for the dead eſtabliſhed in the New Teſtament alſo?

A. It is by poſitive, as well as by negative proofs. The negative proofs are, that our Lord and his Apoſtles have condemned the practices of the Jews, which they found blame-worthy. If they had accounted among theſe, the praying for the dead, which was in conſtant uſe among the Jews before the chriſtian era, as is proved from this book of the Machabees, even to thoſe, who regard it merely as common hiſtory: if, I ſay, ſuch prayer had ſeemed ſinful to our Lord and his Apoſtles, our Lord would have condemned it, and would have told the prieſts, whoſe diſorders he reproved with ſo much freedom, that it was an invention to gratify their avarice: and the Apoſtles would have inſtructed the converted Jews to lay aſide this cuſtom: inſtead of which, our Lord and his Apoſtles leave the Jews in this reſpect to their old devotions.

Q. How is prayer for the dead eſtabliſhed by poſitive proofs in the New Teſtament?

A. Something to this purpoſe is found in the hiſtory of the penitent thief. The Proteſtants, making a wrong uſe of it, argue againſt prayer for the dead, from our Lord's ſaying to him: *This day thou ſhalt be with me in paradiſe.* * But the true tendency of it is rather to recommend prayer for the dead, becauſe the penitent thief ſays to our Lord: *Remember me when thou ſhalt come into thy kingdom.* He was upon the point of expiring with the Lord Jeſus; nevertheleſs, he does not ſay, Grant me to enter with thee into thy kingdom: his deſire is only to enter thither after our Lord, and he ſays, *Remember me, when thou ſhalt come into thy kingdom.* He conceived then, that death, which would tranſport

* Luke xxiii. 43.

our Lord into his kingdom, would carry him, not into his kingdom, but to a place in which Jeſus Chriſt, reigning in glory, might ſhew him mercy.

Q. This reflection is of no great weight; for as the penitent thief was unacquainted with religious truths, it is not ſurpriſing he ſhould believe that ſouls might, after death, enter into a ſtate, which is neither paradiſe nor hell.

A. The penitent thief was filled upon his croſs with extraordinary grace from the Holy Ghoſt. It is therefore agreeable to the light of the Holy Ghoſt to think with him, that after death there was ſome ſtate, in which men might receive favor from God. Beſides, if we conſider the penitent thief merely as a perſon brought up in the Jewiſh Church, this paſſage ſhews, that the Church of God then believed men could, after death, be in a ſtate to expect divine mercy; which is ſufficient to prove, that it is uſeful to pray to God for the departed. In ſhort, whatever might give occaſion to this opinion in the penitent thief, we muſt obſerve, that our Lord approves it by his ſilence, and far from condemning him of error, promiſes him more than he had deſired. The penitent thief had only entreated our Lord to remember him when he ſhould come into his kingdom; and our Lord promiſes to give him entrance into this kingdom, at the ſame time that he ſhould enter into it himſelf. What paſſed upon this occaſion, is therefore incomparably a more weighty argument to prove the utility of praying for the dead, than to deny it. Again, does not our Lord ſay, *that of every idle word men ſhall render an account at the day of judgment.* * Now idle words cannot ſubject them to *everlaſting* puniſhment; therefore there muſt be ſome ſmaller pain to ſuffer at this day of judgment, which, according to the Apoſtle, takes place immediately after death. And this ſmaller

* Matt. xii. 36.

pain it is, that chriſtians will ſuffer for *idle* words, which they have not expiated by penance.

Q. Go on with your obſervations, from the New Teſtament, to prove this point.

A. St. Paul, in his ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy, prays for Oneſiphorus: and we can ſcarce doubt of his being dead when the Apoſtle wrote this Epiſtle. This appears on comparing the end of the Epiſtle with the beginning. In the end, where St. Paul ſalutes his friends, he ſalutes the family of Oneſiphorus, and not Oneſiphorus himſelf: on the other hand, in the beginning, he prays for him apart, after having prayed for his family. The reaſon of this difference is, that Oneſiphorus being dead could not be ſaluted, but could be prayed for.

Q. Have you any other reflection to make hereupon?

A. If Oneſiphorus had not been dead, St Paul would have aſked of God for him, as he had juſt done for his family, *the gift of mercy:* for this is the ordinary form, in which St. Paul and the other Apoſtles pray for the living. But he ſays: *The Lord grant to him to find mercy of the Lord in that day.** And this is the form of praying for the dead, which has always been uſed in the Church.

Q. Is there nothing in the writings of the other Apoſtles, which may have relation to prayer for the dead?

A. St. John tells us, that there is *a ſin not unto death*, † for which let one aſk: this is to be underſtood concerning the faithful departed, who are not yet admitted to everlaſting life.

Q. How do you know that this relates to the faithful departed?

A. The Apoſtle ſets the ſins, for which one may aſk, in oppoſition to the mortal ſins, for which one may not

---

* 2 Tim. i. 18. † 1 John v. 16.

aſk. *I do not ſay*, ſays he, *that any one ſhould aſk for that ſin.* * Now it is only concerning the dead, that a diſtinction can be made of ſins, which ſhould only hinder us from praying to God for them, when they have been ſeen to die in impenitence. For whilſt men are in the world, there is no ſin, which ſhould hinder us from praying for them.

Q. The Church teaches us not only to pray for them, but alſo to pray that they may be delivered from Purgatory. Has our Lord ſaid any thing, which may have relation to this ſtate, called by the Church a ſtate of purgation, or Purgatory?

A. Yes; in ſpeaking of that priſon, from which there is no deliverance without paying the laſt farthing. † It appears alſo more clearly, that he thought of it, when he taught that there are ſins, which, not having been forgiven in this world, ſhall be forgiven in the other. This he does, when he ſhews the heinouſneſs of the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, in that *it ſhall not be forgiven either in this world, or in the world to come.* ‡ This explication is the more to be received, as the Jews, according to whoſe language Chriſt ſpoke, taught that ſome ſins, of which the pardon could not be obtained in this life, would be pardoned in the other. Some noted Proteſtants have themſelves remarked, that our Lord alludes to this opinion of the Jews. §

Q. Have the Apoſtles alſo ſaid any thing, which may have relation to purgatory?

A. St. Paul teaches us, that men can lay no other foundation, but that of Jeſus Chriſt; and that if they build upon this foundation, gold, ſilver, precious ſtones, that is good works, they ſhall receive a reward; but on the contrary, ſuch Chriſtians as ſhall have built upon this foundation, wood, hay, or ſtubble, that is, imperfect

---

* Ibid.
† Matt. v. 26.
‡ Matt. xii. 32.
§ Hammond on this verſe.

works, ſhall ſuffer loſs; but they themſelves ſhall be ſaved, yet ſo as by fire. *

Q. Is there nothing in the writings of the other Apoſtles, which may have relation to purgatory?

A. St. Peter teaches that Chriſt, being brought to death in the fleſh, but quickened in the ſpirit, went and preached to the ſpirits that were in priſon. †

Q. Does the Holy Scripture furniſh any general anſwer to the objections, which Proteſtants form from the paſſages, where we are taught that God pardons our ſins through his mercy, and that our Lord has waſhed them away by his precious blood?

A. This goodneſs of God, and theſe merits of Jeſus Chriſt, leave us ſtill under the neceſſity of endeavouring to apply them to ourſelves by faith, by repentance, and by partaking of the ſacraments. It is therefore certain, from the Holy Scripture, that what is of uſe in applying the merits of Chriſt, which Catholics pronounce certain pains endured in the other world to be, does not interfere with the perfection of the mercy of God, nor the inexhauſtibleneſs of the merits of the death of Chriſt.

Q. When we ſay, that the faithful have ſtill to make expiation for their ſins, and ſatisfaction to the juſtice of God; is not this to diſparage the death of Chriſt, by which our ſins have been perfectly expiated, and the juſtice of God, which has been fully ſatisfied by that death?

A. Theſe expreſſions ought to raiſe no difficulty, becauſe we are obliged, by the Catholic Church, to confine the meaning of them to the application of the merits of the death of Chriſt. There is ſtill more boldneſs in the expreſſion of St. Paul, where he repreſents the afflictions of this life, as things, which fulfil what was wanting to the death of Chriſt. *I fill up*, ſays he, *the things, that are wanting of the ſufferings of Chriſt, in my fleſh for his body, which is the Church.* ‡ We are

* 1 Cor. iii. 12, 15. † 1 Pet. iii. 18, 19. ‡ Col. i. 24.

not, however, offended at this ſtrong expreſſion, becauſe we learn from other places to qualify it, and reduce it to a ſenſe entirely conſiſtent with the perfection of our Lord's ſufferings.

Q. Does not the Holy Scripture more directly ſhew, that God, without doing prejudice to his infinite mercy, can grant the pardon of our ſins, upon our undergoing a certain puniſhment?

A. Yes, it is plain and expreſs in this particular: for it directs us to conſider the afflictions of this life, and the ſtroke of death, as ſlight puniſhments, which God thinks proper to make us ſuffer for our ſins. Whatſoever can be with truth alleged to reconcile theſe puniſhments with the paſſages, which ſpeak of the perfection of the mercy of God, and of the ſufferings of Chriſt, will ſerve equally to prove, that what the faithful may ſuffer in the other world, is not inconſiſtent with this perfection.

Q. May it not be ſaid, that afflictions in this world are chaſtiſements intended for our amendment, and ought not to be conſidered as puniſhments for our ſins?

A. It is true, that afflictions are the chaſtiſements of a father, and intended to correct our future conduct; but it is contradicting holy writ, to deny, that God diſpenſes them alſo with a view to what is paſt, as a puniſhment of ſins already committed, and a puniſhment quite reconcileable with the pardon he grants of thoſe ſins.

Q. Prove this point.

A. When David had given marks of repentance for having cauſed the people to be numbered, God, notwithſtanding, determined to puniſh him with one of his ſcourges, and did effectually puniſh him with that of the peſtilence, which David choſe; * and with regard to his ſin of adultery, Nathan told him plainly; *the Lord hath taken away thy ſin, nevertheleſs*, added he, on the part of

* 2 Sam. xxiv. 10, 12, 15.

God, *becauſe thou haſt made the Lord's enemies to blaſpheme, thy child ſhall ſurely die.* * He had told him before that his wives would one day be taken from him, as he had taken the wife of Urias. Thus the pardon, that God grants of our ſins, is not incompatible with the vengeance inflicted by his juſtice.

Q. Proceed in ſhewing from the word of God, that the afflictions, which he ſends, are not only deſigned for the amendment of his ſervants, but are the puniſhment of paſt offences.

A. This is a certain truth, becauſe among the puniſhments, with which God chaſtiſes the offences of his children, the Scripture reckons death itſelf. Thus God ſaid to Moſes and to Aaron: *Becauſe you have not believed me, to ſanctify me before the children of Iſrael, you ſhall not introduce this people into the land, which I will give them.* † *Thou ſhalt be gathered to thy people,* ſaid God to Moſes immediately before his death, *as Aaron thy brother died in Mount Hor, becauſe you ſinned againſt me at the waters of contradiction.* ‡ It is not to be doubted but amongſt thoſe ſix hundred thouſand perſons, that came out of Egypt, and died in their way to the land of Canaan, there were many, who truly repented of their ſins, and yet, though they obtained forgiveneſs, God puniſhed them by forbidding their entry into the promiſed land. *I have forgiven according to thy word,* ſaid God to Moſes, *yet all the men ſhall not ſee the land.* § We may argue in the ſame manner concerning the vaſt number, who periſhed in the deluge: this the Holy Spirit ſeems to indicate, when he ſays: *The Goſpel was preached to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the fleſh, but may live according to God in the Spirit.* ¶

Q. What concluſion muſt be drawn from all that has been ſaid?

---

* 2 Sam. xii. 13, 14.
† Num. xx. 12.
‡ Deut. xxxii. 49.
§ Num. xiv. 20.
¶ 1 Pet. iii. 19, iv. 6.

A. You may conclude that it is not leſſening the perfection of God's mercy, nor the infinitude of Chriſt's merits, to ſay that ſome of the faithful, whoſe ſins God has pardoned, are ſtill ſubject to certain puniſhments: and, on the contrary, that it is directly oppoſing the Holy Scripture, and falling into hereſy, to teach, that in this there is any inconſiſtency.

Q. This is ſufficient to anſwer the objections drawn from the paſſages, which ſpeak of the mercy of God, and the efficacy of the death of Chriſt: now reply to thoſe, where it is expreſsly taught, that the faithful have nothing to fear. For example, St. Paul ſays: *There is now no condemnation to thoſe who are in Chriſt Jeſus, who walk not according to the fleſh, but according to the ſpirit.* * *He*, ſays our Lord, *who heareth my word, and believeth him that ſent me, hath everlaſting life, and cometh not to judgment, but is paſſed from death to life.* †

A. In theſe places is meant everlaſting puniſhment, which alone is properly ſpeaking to be ſtyled condemnation. With regard to the paſſage from St. Paul, the Apoſtle's intention was only to ſhew, that Chriſtians ought not to fear the being condemned, becauſe the grace of Jeſus Chriſt delivered them from ſin, and cauſed them to lead holy lives; but that the Jews, whoſe corrupt paſſions the law rather irritated than aſſuaged, were expoſed to the vengeance of divine juſtice: ſo that here is nothing either in ſupport of purgatory or againſt it, becauſe *eternal* condemnation is meant in this place. St. Paul declares, that the profeſſion of the Chriſtian Religion is not, as the Jews ſaid, the way to everlaſting damnation, but, on the contrary, the way to eternal life. This truth he had eſtabliſhed in the preceding chapters, of which this verſe is a ſort of concluſion; as in it St. Paul ſums up his doctrine, namely, that *condemnation* is not to be feared by Chriſtians, whoſe lives

* Rom. viii. 1. † John v. 24.

are conſonant to their faith. But, to conclude from thence that the Apoſtles did not believe a purgatory, is as idle, as it would be, to maintain that the Catholics believe none at preſent; becauſe they often tell ſinners, that they are in the way to deſtruction, and that the Catholics, on the contrary, who live up to the duties of their religion, have nothing to fear.

Q. Let us now hear, what you anſwer to the text: *He who heareth my word, and believeth him that hath ſent me, hath life everlaſting, and he falleth not into condemnation, but hath paſſed from death to life.*

A. Our Lord means, that he who believes in him, is removed from a ſtate of wrath to a ſtate of grace and ſalvation; which he expreſſes by ſaying, he has paſſed from death to life. Here is not the leaſt mention made of what happens to man after death; but only of the right, which good Chriſtians acquire during their life-time by faith. Therefore Chriſt ſays of ſuch a one believing in him, not that *he* SHALL *paſs from death to life*, as ſome Proteſtants have tranſlated; but, that *he* HATH *paſſed from death to life.*

Q. Proteſtants likewiſe tell us, that the belief of temporary puniſhments after death, does not agree with thoſe texts, which repreſent the dead as reſting in peace; ſuch are the following: *Now thou doſt diſmiſs thy ſervant, O Lord, according to thy word, in peace.** *Thou ſhalt be gathered to thy ſepulchre in peace.*† *Let peace come, let him that hath walked in his uprightneſs reſt in his bed.*‡ *Bleſſed are the dead, who die in the Lord—they may reſt from their labours.*§

A. Much might be ſaid on every one of theſe texts in particular; but it is ſufficient to obſerve in general, that the reſt here ſpoken of, regards either the paſt, that is, the evils and dangers of the world, from which we are

---

* Luke ii. 29.
† 2 Kings xxii. 20.
‡ Iſ. lvii. 2.
§ Apoc. xiv. 13.

delivered by death; or the future, that is, the certainty, which the faithful have of endleſs beatitude; or if this reſt is ſuppoſed to regard the preſent, then it means the love of God, of which the faithful departed have received a large increaſe. On all theſe accounts the ſervants of God have reaſon to rejoice, when dying: and, after they are dead, it may be ſaid of them, that in theſe reſpects they are in peace, notwithſtanding the ſufferings, by which their everlaſting joys are retarded.

Q. Can you ſhew by the Holy Scripture, that the reſt of the faithful is not inconſiſtent with ſufferings?

A. The faithful are often mentioned in it as ſuffering with regard to the body, whilſt their ſouls are in peace, on account of the love of God, with which they are animated. Thus the Apoſtle encourages the firſt Chriſtians in the midſt of their tribulations to ſay: *Being therefore juſtified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* * If, notwithſtanding the weakneſs of faith, and the frailty of man, and the ſmall aſſurance which this frailty allowed them to conceive of their ſalvation, they were ſtill even encouraged to rejoice in their afflictions; it is not difficult to conceive, that the ſtate of the faithful in the other world may be called a ſtate of peace, ſince in the midſt of their ſufferings, they are ſecure of ſeeing God face to face, and poſſeſſing him to all eternity.

Q. How are we to anſwer Proteſtants, when they refer to texts, which ſeem to repreſent glory as taking place immediately upon the death of the faithful; ſuch are the following: *This day thou ſhalt be with me in paradiſe.* † *I ſee*, ſays St. Stephen, breathing his laſt, *the heavens open, and Jeſus ſtanding at the right hand of God.* ‡ *Having a deſire*, ſays St. Paul, *to be diſſolved and to be with Chriſt, a thing by far the better.* § *We*

---

* Rom. v. 1.
† Luke xxii. 43.
‡ Acts vii. 45.
§ Phil. i. 23.

know, that if the earthly houſe of this dwelling be diſſolved, we have a building of God, a houſe not made with hands, eternal in heaven. * *Bleſſed are the dead, who die in the Lord: from henceforth, ſaith the Spirit, that they may reſt from their labours, for their works follow them?* †

A. It is to be obſerved of ſome of theſe texts, that the Holy Spirit repreſents glory as the immediate conſequence of death, not to deny the exiſtence of a third ſtate, in regard of many of the faithful departed: but, as this third ſtate is only a ſtate of paſſage, the Holy Spirit has not thought proper to dwell upon the conſideration of it in theſe texts, where nothing more was neceſſary than to give that view of futurity, which might render death an object of deſire to the faithful; that is, to ſet before them the joys of paradiſe.

Q. Strengthen this anſwer by ſome proof.

A. It may be obſerved that Catholics, to comfort the afflicted, are every day ſpeaking to them of death as of the immediate paſſage to the glory of paradiſe, and yet ſuch diſcourſe does not in any ſort interfere with their belief of a ſtate, wherein the ſouls of the imperfect are purified: but examples may be produced from the Holy Scripture itſelf of this cuſtom of thus uniting two ſeparate things, eſpecially when what ſeparates them is but a place or ſtate of paſſage.

Q. Produce an example of this.

A. We meet with a very ſatisfactory one in St. Luke's Goſpel. *When they had performed all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee to their own city Nazareth.* ‡ It is certain, from the Goſpel hiſtory, that the bleſſed Virgin and St. Joſeph fled from Jeruſalem into Egypt, before they returned to Nazareth, and remained there till the death of Archelaus: § nevertheleſs, in the verſe which I have cited, St. Luke connects together the journey to Jeruſalem and the

---

* 2 Cor. v. 1. † Apoc. xiv. 13. ‡ Luke ii. 39. § Matt. ii.

abode at Nazareth; becauſe the going into Egypt was only what paſſed in the mean while, to which St. Luke has not thought proper to ſhew any regard in this part of his narration. In the ſame manner St. Paul, not attending to the ſtate of thoſe ſouls, who are doomed to expiatory pains in the other world, thus expreſſes himſelf: *We know, that if the earthly houſe of this preſent habitation be diſſolved, we have a buildi g of God, a houſe not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.* And as purgatory is but a ſtate of paſſage, it is not at all neceſſary to take it into conſideration, when comfort is to be adminiſtered to Chriſtians in their afflictions: and ſuch was the deſign of St. Paul on this occaſion.

Q. Have you nothing to add concerning theſe laſt texts, which I have brought againſt you?

A. It is to be obſerved, that theſe texts, or at leaſt the greater part of them, are expreſſive of ſome extraordinary graces, as is acknowledged by Catholics, agreeably to holy Writ. We believe, that our Lord ſo near to his own death inſpired the penitent thief with perfect contrition and charity, and brought him into immediate glory. We believe, that St. Stephen and the other Martyrs, fervent as they were in the love of God, had no pains to ſuffer after thoſe of their martyrdom. We believe alſo, that many Chriſtians, as perfect and as diſtinguiſhed by their labours as the Apoſtles were, have been immediately united to Jeſus Chriſt after their departure from this world, though they have not ſuffered martyrdom. Now this is all that is meant by the texts you have quoted: for even in that of the Apocalypſe, which appears more general, thoſe who die in the Lord, are thoſe who die for the Lord; thoſe for whom the perſecutions, ſpoken of in this place, procure the crown of martyrdom. All this has nothing to do with the ſtate of thoſe of the faithful after death, who have lived and died with certain blemiſhes upon them: and it is only for ſuch imperfect Chriſtians,

that there is a ſtate of purification, and only for them, that the Catholic Church offers up prayers to God.

CHAP. XIV.

Of Juſtification.

Q. BY what means are we juſtified before God, as his word obliges us to believe?

A. Only by the merits of the death of Jeſus Chriſt. *His grace*, ſays St. Paul, *juſtifies us freely through the redemption, which is in Chriſt Jeſus.* *

Q. Let us ſpeak of the means, by which the merits of Chriſt are applied to us; for it is in this point, that the Reformers do not eaſily fall in with the doctrine of the Church. What conditions of juſtification does the word of God ſet forth?

A. It every where propoſes good works, as well as faith, to be a condition of juſtification. For ſhortneſs ſake, out of innumerable texts, I will take only two, one from the Old Teſtament, the other from the New: *If the wicked man*, ſays God, by the mouth of Ezechiel, *do penance for all his ſins and keep my commandments, and do judgment and juſtice, he ſhall not die; I will not remember all his iniquities, and by the juſtice which he hath wrought he ſhall live.* † *Do ye ſee*, ſays St. James, *that man is juſtified by works, and not by faith only.?* ‡

Q. St. Paul ſays; *A man is juſtified by faith, without the works of the Law.* §

A. The Apoſtle does not ſay, a man is juſtified by faith without the works of the Goſpel. Every body

* Rom. iii. 24. † Ezech. xviii. 21, 22.
‡ Jam. ii. 24. § Rom. iii. 28.

knows that thoſe works, which belong to the law in oppoſition to the Goſpel, no longer contribute to ſalvation; but, on the contrary, are deſtructive of it; St. Paul having ſaid: *If you be circumciſed, Chriſt will profit you nothing.* But when the New Teſtament treats of the works of the goſpel, and not of thoſe of the law, it expreſsly ranks them with the conditions of juſtification. *If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.* * *Whoſoever ſhall call upon the name of the Lord, ſhall be ſaved.* † *Every one that hath left his houſe, &c. for my name's ſake, ſhall receive a hundred fold, and poſſeſs life everlaſting.* ‡ *Do you ſee that man is juſtified by works, and not by faith only?* §

Q. Has not then St. Paul by having ſaid, *man is juſtified by faith*, excluded from amongſt the conditions of juſtification, the works preſcribed by the Goſpel?

A. On the contrary, the Apoſtle means even here to include them; for the word *faith* in this place ſignifies the Chriſtian Religion in general, as the works of the law ſignify the Jewiſh: and the ſenſe of the text is, that from that hour men were to be ſaved, not by Judaiſm, but by Chriſtianity; a point, which was diſputed in the time of St. Paul. The word faith is uſed in the ſame ſenſe in the Epiſtle to the Galatians: *before faith came, we were kept under the law;* ¶ that is, until the Chriſtian Religion was eſtabliſhed, we were ſubject to that of Moſes: juſt ſo St. Paul ſays here, *we are juſtified by faith;* that is, the Chriſtian Religion alone can ſave us. Accordingly, as obedience to the precepts of Chriſt forms an eſſential part of his Religion, this paſſage of St. Paul does not exclude the works, which the Goſpel orders, from the conditions of juſtification; but on the contrary neceſſarily includes them.

Q. Is there not a degree of pride in believing, that we

---

* Matt. xix. 17. † Acts ii. 21. ‡ Matt. xix. 29.
§ Jam. ii. 24. ¶ Gal. iii. 23.

are juſtified before God, not only by faith, but alſo by our good works?

A. No. For we ſay, according to the Holy Scripture, that we deſerve nothing of ourſelves, and that our good works do not merit the remiſſion of our ſins and ſalvation, otherwiſe than in virtue of the aſſurance we have in the promiſes of our heavenly father, he having mercifully aſſigned this recompence to our good works, for the ſake of the infinite dignity of his ſon, who, by his death, has purchaſed theſe advantages for ſuch as obey him: in a word, through the grace of the Holy Ghoſt, who is the author of all good works, God has promiſed, in ſeveral places, that he who ſhall believe, and ſhall keep his commandments, ſhall obtain pardon of his ſins, and be ſaved. Jeſus Chriſt has merited, by his death, that all thoſe who love him, and are faithful in the execution of the laws of the goſpel, ſhould be partakers of the advantages purchaſed by him. The Holy Ghoſt himſelf, by his grace, does in us all the good which we do. Wherefore, in rewarding our works, God rewards his own gifts. * Such is the ſort of merit, which we attribute to the faithful: a merit, which aſcribes all glory to God alone, and to man none at all.

Q. If there is no pride in the thing itſelf, which you underſtand by merit, is there not ſome at leaſt in the term? Would it not be better to reject it, and expreſs in ſome other manner, the neceſſary connection, which God of his mercy has eſtabliſhed betwixt good works and glory?

A. As the word of God has never given any command to the Church, to avoid uſing any term which is not found in holy writ, this is one of the things in reſpect of which we are moſt indiſputably ſubject to her authority. We ought to learn the language of our

* S. Aug.

mother, and not give law to her. We obey God, when we approve the words, which the whole Church is accuſtomed to uſe, ſuch as that of the Sacrament and others, though they are not to be found in the Holy Scriptures, as to their ſound and ſyllables, but only as to their real meaning.

Q. Have you nothing to ſay upon the word, *Merit?*

A. I ſay, that the Holy Scripture contains expreſſions of equal import with it. *God hath made us worthy to be partakers of the Saints in light.* * *That you may be accounted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which alſo you ſuffer.* † *God is not unjuſt, that he ſhould forget your works.* ‡ *There is laid up for me a crown of juſtice, which the Lord the juſt judge will render to me at that day.* § *They ſhall walk with me in white, becauſe they are worthy.* ¶

Q. Are all the ſins, for which we crave the pardon of God towards our juſtification, repreſented in the Holy Scripture as mortal ſins, that is to ſay, as ſins, by committing which a man loſes the love of God, and is no longer in a ſtate of Salvation?

A. No: for ſome are there mentioned, as not depriving the faithful of God's grace. Concerning this doctrine, the language of our Lord and his Apoſtles is, that there are ſome ſins as large as beams, and others but as motes in the eye of the offender. The former are the ſins of thoſe, who build at a diſtance from the foundation: the latter are of thoſe, who build indeed upon the foundation, but with wood, and hay, and ſtubble: of men who offend in this ſort it is ſaid, *they themſelves ſhall be ſaved.* ‖

Q. Produce ſome examples.

A. When Moſes alleged his incapacity as an excuſe for his not accepting the commiſſion, which God gave him to deliver the Iſraelites, he committed a ſin; for it

---

* Col. i. 12. † Theſ. i. 5. ‡ Heb. vi. 10.
§ 2 Tim. iv. 8. ¶ Apoc. iii. 4. ‖ 1 Cor. iii. 15.

is ſaid, *the Lord was angry*: * but it was not a ſin, which deprived him of the Grace of God. It was alſo a fault in the Iſraelites, that they ſacrificed on the high places, and in their Kings, that they did not deſtroy them; becauſe, after the Temple was built, it was God's pleaſure that the worſhip, which had been performed on theſe ſacred ſpots, ſhould then ceaſe, and that in the Temple alone ſacrifices ſhould be offered. Accordingly the Holy Spirit often blames thoſe Kings, who did not deſtroy theſe high places; and, on the contrary, commends Ezechias and Joſias, who ſhewed great zeal in demoliſhing them. †

Q. How do you know that the frequenting and preſerving of theſe high places was a ſin, which did not deprive the offenders of God's grace?

A. Becauſe God alone was there adored. In effect, before the erection of the Temple, theſe very places were in a ſpecial manner appointed by God whereon to offer ſacrifice. *The people ſacrificed in the high places, for there was no Temple built to the Lord until that day.* ‡ We actually find in the Holy Scripture ſeveral of theſe high places, at Jeruſalem, at Hebron, at Ramatha, at Bethlehem, and in other parts where the Prophets are ſaid to have ſacrificed. § The people knowing they had received from God various favors, in theſe various places, could not perſuade themſelves to diſcontinue the ſervice of him there, and conſidered the Temple of Jeruſalem only as the chief of the holy places, where God was to be ſerved. Accordingly the Prieſts, who ſacrificed on theſe high places, eat notwithſtanding the Paſch at Jeruſalem, with the others: Solomon, who built the Temple, uſed ſtill to ſacrifice on theſe high places, and other pious Kings preſerved them for the ſame purpoſe; and the Holy Scripture ſays expreſsly

* Exod. iv. 14. † 2 Kings xviii. 4. ‡ 1 Kings iii. 2.
§ 1 Sam. vii. 17.—xx. 6. 2 Sam. xiv. 12. 1 Kings i. 9.

concerning theſe places, at the time of the repentance of Manaſſes: *Nevertheleſs the people ſtill ſacrificed in the high places to the Lord their God.* *

Q. Shew from the Holy Scripture, that thus to worſhip God in places no longer approved of by him, was not a ſin, which ſeparated the offenders from his grace and love.

A. The Holy Scripture conſiders as Saints ſeveral of the Kings of Judah, who preſerved theſe high places. It ſays of Aſa: *The high places he did not take away, nevertheleſs his heart was perfect with the Lord all his days.* † It ſays of Joſaphat his ſon: *He did that which was right in the ſight of the Lord, nevertheleſs he took not away the high places.* ‡ It ſpeaks almoſt in the ſame manner of the Kings, Joas, Amazias, Azarias, and Joatham, reproaching them for not having deſtroyed theſe high places, as Ezechias and Joſias did. We have here then inſtances of ſins, which, according to the judgment of the Holy Spirit, do not alienate the faithful from the grace and love of God. Theſe are what the Catholic Church calls *venial* ſins.

Q. Are there, in the New Teſtament, any examples of venial ſins?

A. St. Paul ſeems to rank, in this number, the faults of certain Corinthians, who, inſtead of voluntarily abandoning ſome of their diſputed property, choſe rather to expoſe themſelves, and the contending parties, to the ſins, with which law-ſuits are uſually attended. *It is a fault among you*, ſays he, *that you have law-ſuits one with another. Why do not you rather take the wrong?* § But St. Paul diſtinguiſhes this ſin from the injuſtice, which he mentions afterwards, as incompatible with ſalvation. ¶

Q. Speak now concerning works of ſupererogation,

---

* 2 Chron. xxxiii. 17. † 1 Kings xv. 14.
‡ 1 Kings xxii. 43, 44. § 1 Cor. vi. 7. ¶ Ibid. 9.

which are a very great eye-ſore to Proteſtants. Are they approved or condemned by the word of God?

A. They are recommended in ſeveral places. For inſtance, Moſes gives rules to the Iſraelites reſpecting their voluntary oblations, and particularly the vow of the Nazareans, by which they offered themſelves in a ſtricter manner to the ſervice of God for a certain time, or for their whole life. * The ſame may be ſaid in general of all vows: God commanded none of them: it was, however, agreeable to him, that holy perſons under the old law ſhould make them, and having made, ſhould duly fulfil them.

Q. Do the Prophets ſpeak of this ſort of works, as worthy of praiſe, though not commanded?

A. Jeremias ſays, that God promiſed his bleſſing to the Rechabites, becauſe they had faithfully adhered to the laws, which they had made for themſelves, of not drinking wine, nor poſſeſſing lands or houſes. †

Q. What is to be learned from the New Teſtament, concerning theſe voluntary works, or works of ſupererogation?

A. We find that they are there commended, as well as in the Old Teſtament. For example, though it be allowable for the Miniſters of the Church, in doing their functions, to receive what is neceſſary for their ſubſiſtence, St. Paul glories in God, for having received the grace of preaching the goſpel without any recompence. ‡ It was alſo a work of ſupererogation in the faithful at Jeruſalem, that they ſold their eſtates and dedicated the price of them to the ſervice of the Church; for St. Peter ſaid to Ananias: *While the field remained, did it not remain to thee, and after it was ſold, was it not in thy power?* §

Q. However it ſeems that ſome perſons incurred the

---

* Num. vi.
† Jer. xxxv. 18, 19.
‡ 1 Cor. ix. 14, 15.
§ Acts v. 4.

diſpleaſure of God, to whom he ſays: *Who required theſe things at your hands.** From whence it follows, that to make a work agreeable to God, he muſt firſt require it of us.

A. This paſſage does not make againſt the works of ſupererogation, for God requires theſe works of us, though he does not command them: he requires them of us, by ſignifying that they are tokens of great love towards him; that in this road the holieſt of his children have delighted to walk; and that to ſuch ſervices he has aſſigned the moſt glorious rewards.

Q. How then muſt we underſtand the text, to which I have referred?

A. It contains a figure, like what we find in many other paſſages of holy writ: *The ſacrifice of a contrite heart*, ſays David, *thou wilt not deſpiſe*,† that is, thou acceptеſt it, it pleaſeth thee above all things. *I am not aſhamed*, ſays St. Paul, *of the Goſpel*,‡ that is, I eſteem it my glory. In the ſame manner, when God ſays to the Jews, *Who required theſe things at your hands?* the meaning is, I have forbidden them. In this ſenſe God ſaid to the Jews, by the prophet Jeremias: *They built the high places of Topheth, which is in the valley of the ſon of Ennon: to burn their ſons and their daughters in the fire: which I commanded not, nor thought on in my heart.* §

Q. Upon what do you ground this explanation?

A. God ſpeaks in this place to ſuch of the Jews as were guilty of enormous crimes, as appears by the context; and tells them, that ſo long as they ſhall perſevere in their abominations, he will abhor even the moſt ſolemn homage they ſhall pay him; becauſe the actions, that were holy in themſelves, they did in ſuch a diſpoſition of mind, as rendered them profane and criminal.

---

* Iſ. i. 12. † Pſ. l. 19. ‡ Rom. i. 16. § Jer. vii. 31.

Q. Is faſting one of the works, which may recommend us to God's favor?

A. I have already ſhewn, in another place, that the word of God approves faſting, and other mortifications of the fleſh.

Q. The Reformers alſo approve of faſts. They only condemn ſuch as are fixed to certain times of the year. Does not the word of God agree with them in condemning this ſort of faſt?

A. It teaches us, that the ancient Church had appointed ſeveral ſuch faſts, which were fixed to certain months, that the Jews might humble themſelves before God, on account of ſeveral extraordinary effects of his anger, which had at thoſe times fallen upon them. * In like manner, the Chriſtian Church has always obſerved, before Eaſter, a ſolemn faſt, in memory of the death of Jeſus Chriſt, having thereby literally accompliſhed his ſaying: *When the bridegroom ſhall be taken from them, then ſhall they faſt.* †

Q. As the Proteſtants particularly object to the prohibition made by the Church, of eating fleſh on faſt days, tell me whether the Scripture condemns every abſtinence from fleſh?

A. It blames ſuch abſtinence only, when eſtabliſhed out of heretical motives by men, who believed, that meats, too often abuſed to intemperance, came from an evil principle, and that it was not God, who created them; but it does not blame it, when eſtabliſhed for holy purpoſes, as in the Catholic Church.

Q. How do you know that this is the ſenſe of the paſſage from St. Paul on this ſubject? ‡

A. I know it from the paſſage itſelf, and from other texts of the Old and New Teſtament. The paſſage ſuggeſts three different reflections. Firſt, St. Paul ſays: *Some ſhall depart from the faith.* This cannot agree with

---

* Zach. viii. 19. † Matt. ix. 15. ‡ 1 Tim. iv. 1, 2, 3.

the practice of the Church in this particular; which practice is not oppoſite to any one article of faith, and by the confeſſion of all, has been for many ages, not the cuſtom of ſome individuals, but univerſal.

Q. What is the ſecond reflection, by which you would ſhew that all prohibitions of fleſh are not meant?

A. St. Paul ſtiles the doctrine, of which he ſpeaks here, a doctrine of devils. Now it would be very extraordinary to apply that term to the doctrine of celibacy, and abſtinence from fleſh, or faſt days, ſince the Proteſtants themſelves confeſs them to have been obſerved by the whole Church in the pureſt ages, by the martyrs, and by the moſt learned and holy of the fathers.

Q. What is the third reflection upon this paſſage, which confirms the ſenſe you give to it?

A. St. Paul gives as a reaſon for his oppoſition to this prohibition of meats, that God created them: which aſſertion does not contradict any opinion of the Catholics, who conſider them as God's creatures; but is oppoſed to the error of ſeveral ancient heretics, who ſaid God had not created them.

Q. How do you collect from the Old Teſtament, that the doctrine, which prohibits meats upon a good principle, is not the doctrine of devils, ſpoken of by St. Paul?

A. Becauſe, in order to repreſent the diſtinction between Jews and Gentiles, God commanded Moſes to diſtinguiſh the clean animals from the unclean, and forbad the latter to be eaten. *

Q. How do you prove the ſame from the New Teſtament?

A. The Apoſtles, from an apprehenſion of giving too much diſguſt to the Jews, forbad the firſt Chriſtians to eat of things ſtrangled. †

---

* Lev. xi. † Acts xv. 29.

Q. What do you infer from this?

A. I infer that the Chriſtian Church has had a juſt right to forbid the uſe of fleſh, on faſt days, from a principle of piety; becauſe, generally ſpeaking, fleſh is not a nouriſhment conducive to the humiliation of the body.

Q. I do not allege againſt you the text, where our Lord ſays: *Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth the man,* * becauſe you have already, on another occaſion, ſhewn that the word of God does not allow us to underſtand it in its largeſt extent.

A. Though it ſhould be taken in its fulleſt extent, it would not affect the law of the Church, prohibiting fleſh; for when any one tranſgreſſes this law, it is not what he eats that defiles him, but the ſpirit with which he eats, that is, a ſpirit of diſobedience to the authority appointed by God. Accordingly, if any one eats fleſh in thoſe ſeaſons, when it is prohibited, without having this ſpirit of diſobedience, he is not defiled: and this is the caſe, as often as a real neceſſity calls for a diſpenſation, to be obtained for this purpoſe from thoſe ſpiritual guides, to whom application is then to be made.

Q. Explain the following text of St. Paul: *Whatever is ſold in the ſhambles eat, aſking no queſtions, for conſcience ſake.* †

A. This text relates only to the ſcruple, which many of the Corinthians entertained, concerning the eating of meat bought in the market of the Pagans, or ſerved up at the table of idolaters; becauſe the prieſts, who could not eat all that fell to their ſhare after ſacrificing to idols, ſent it to be ſold; ſo that there was no diſtinguiſhing in the market, nor at table, the meat, which had been offered to idols, from that which had not. St. Paul ſhews, that this did ſhould hinder the Chriſtians

---

* Matt. xv. 11. † 1 Cor. x. 25.

of Corinth from buying at market what they wanted, and from eating with the Pagans of all that was ſet before them, provided a charitable regard for the weak conſciences of certain Chriſtians did not oblige them to act otherwiſe. This is the reaſon why St. Paul ſays, that the Corinthians were not bound in conſcience to aſk any queſtions, that is, to inform themſelves, whether the meat before them had or had not been offered to an idol.

Q. Have you other parts of the Holy Scripture, which ſhew that we muſt not underſtand this text of St. Paul in its largeſt extent? And can you prove that the firſt Chriſtians might not eat of all that was ſold in the market, or ſet upon the table of the Pagans?

A. Yes. For the firſt Chriſtians well knew, that, notwithſtanding this permiſſion of St. Paul, they were forbidden to buy blood and things ſtrangled, and to eat of them if brought to table, and had learnt from the Apoſtle that when forewarned by the Pagans that the meats ſet before them had been previouſly offered to idols, they were not allowed to taſte of them; not indeed becauſe they had contracted any impurity from their oblation to idols, but to avoid giving ſcandal to the weak. For this reaſon St. Paul himſelf aſſures us, that, rather than be an occaſion of ſin to his brethren for whom Chriſt had ſhed his blood, he would not ſo much as touch meat. Hence the faithful would have had ſtill more abhorrence of extending this rule to the markets and unnatural tables of thoſe ſavage people, if ſuch there be, who ſell and devour the bodies of their enemies, or of their ſlaves.

CHAP. XV.

Concluſion.

Q. DO not the Reformers give different ſenſes from yours to all theſe texts, which you have brought to prove the Catholic faith?

A. It is the caſe of all heretics to turn aſide the paſſages, which oppoſe their doctrine, as if they did not bear againſt it. The Arians, for inſtance, give ſuch meanings as favor their errors, to all the texts which eſtabliſh the eternal divinity of our Lord; and the explanations, which they invent for that purpoſe, are not more forced than many of thoſe, which the Proteſtants give to the texts, that prove the truths affirmed by the Catholics, and contradicted by them.

Q. Do theſe explanations, by which the Proteſtants evade the paſſages that oppoſe them, leſſen their force?

A. No, we muſt attack them with the Holy Scripture, and tell them, what has been told to all innovators, that the ſenſes they forge are unknown to the Church: and, in reading the word of God, we muſt prefer the ſenſe of the Church, becauſe Jeſus Chriſt has promiſed to be with it even unto the end of the world.*

Q. Have you any other obſervation to make upon theſe explanations, by which the Proteſtants pretend to diminiſh the force of the texts alledged againſt them?

A. I affirm, that to pretend that any truth is not proved by a paſſage, unleſs it be impoſſible to wreſt it to another ſignification, is to eſtabliſh a principle deſtructive of moſt of the articles of faith, inaſmuch as they are not delivered in texts ſo clear, but that they may be wreſted to another ſenſe by means of ſuch figures, as

* Matt. xxviii. 20.

Chriſtians allow to be admiſſible in interpreting the Holy Scripture. Beſides, it is to condemn the manner, in which our Lord and his Apoſtles reaſoned; for the paſſages, which they quote from the Old Teſtament may have (if the bare text be conſidered,) another meaning from that, by which they proved the Meſſias. Our Lord, however, and his Apoſtles, ſcrupled not to cite them as evident, becauſe, whatever ſenſe might be given to the prophecy, they regarded that ſenſe as evident, which was commonly annexed to the prophecy by the Church of Iſrael, and to which it was invariably fixed by the application, which they themſelves made of it, becauſe there was not then upon earth an authority ſo ſuper-eminent as theirs in matters of religion. The paſſages, which the Catholic Church propoſes to the Proteſtants, are very clear, and can with great difficulty be miſinterpreted, becauſe it has pleaſed God to ſpeak more plainly in the New Teſtament, than in the Old.

Q. Have you no other general reflections to make upon ſo many paſſages ſo favorable to the doctrines of the Catholic Church?

A. I add, that God, knowing beforehand in what ſenſe theſe paſſages would be univerſally received throughout his whole Church, would not have put into his holy word ſo many of them favorable to theſe doctrines, if they had been mortal errors: on the contrary, he would have inſerted texts proper to refute theſe doctrines, which he foreſaw would be generally received by every member of his Church.

Q. Explain this notion by ſome example: tell me what would have been the language of Scripture, if God had conſidered the Church's infallibility as an illuſion, and if he had foreſeen that this Church would have adopted doctrines and practices incompatible with ſalvation.

A. In ſuch a caſe, the wiſdom and goodneſs of God would have cauſed him to ſay in Scripture: *You muſt not always hear the Catholic Church; a day will come, when he who hears it ſhall be accounted a Pagan and an Idolater:*

it will become a Babylon, from which you muſt ſeparate yourſelves: the gates of hell will prevail againſt it: I will not be with it to the end of the world: the ſpirit of truth which I leave to it ſhall not abide in it for ever. Thus would God have ſpoken, if what the Proteſtants reproached the Church with at their ſeparation from it, had been true.

Q. Have you any paſſage of Holy Scripture, which makes it neceſſary to ſay that God would have ſpoken in this manner, if the body of the Church had been to fall into mortal errors and idolatrous practices?

A. I have. For though, in the Church of Iſrael, idolatry was not to be univerſally, nor quietly received, but only favored by a great number, and for a ſhort time, God cauſed this misfortune to be foretold by Moſes: *I know, ſays he, that after my death you will do wickedly, and will provoke God, by worſhipping the works of your own hands.* * The Chriſtian Church is more precious in the ſight of God than that of the Jews was; the Holy Ghoſt would therefore have given ſtill more manifeſt predictions of ſo vaſt a calamity, if the time was to be, when idolatry ſhould prevail among Chriſtians.

Q. Tell us, in the ſame manner, what our Lord would have ſaid concerning the holy Euchariſt, if he had conſidered the doctrines and practices of the Church upon that article, as mortal errors.

A. He would have taken occaſion, from the Jews being ſcandalized at what he had laid down concerning his giving his fleſh to be eaten, to have ſaid: *I do not mean you ſhould eat my fleſh; my fleſh is not meat, my blood is not drink: it is not by eating me, but by being united to me through faith, that eternal life is to be obtained.* In this manner would the charity, with which the Son of God hath loved us, have obliged him to expreſs himſelf, fore-

---

* Deut. xxxi. 29.

ſeeing, as he did, the univerſal belief of the Church on this point, if this belief had been erroneous, as the Proteſtants ſay it is. But if it ſhould appear aſtoniſhing to Proteſtants, that Jeſus Chriſt, having before his eyes ſeveral Jews, who expreſſed to him their uneaſineſs at what he ſaid concerning the eating of his fleſh, ſhould anſwer: *Amen, Amen, if you eat not my fleſh, and drink not my blood, you ſhall not have life in you:* it ought to amaze them much more that our Lord, who foreſaw, that ſo many Chriſtians compoſing the body of his Church, were to embrace, during many ages, the belief of the real preſence which the Reformers condemn, ſhould have been pleaſed to ſay, in the language of everlaſting truth: *Amen, Amen, I ſay unto you, if you eat not my fleſh there is no ſalvation for you: my fleſh is meat indeed; as the living Father hath ſent me, ſo he that eateth me ſhall live by me.*

Q. It is manifeſt that the ſame reflection may be made on the paſſages of Holy Scripture, which you quoted on other points: but in order to refute this ſort of argument, might not the Proteſtants, in like manner, bring together the texts, which they think are advantageous to their ſide, and then ſay; If Jeſus Chriſt, who foreſaw that theſe paſſages would convince us of our doctrines being true, had eſteemed them as doctrines falſe and pernicious, he would not have made uſe of ſuch doubtful expreſſions.

A. There is a great difference betwixt the argument as urged by the Catholics, and as urged by the Proteſtants: for it is not ſurpriſing that our Lord ſhould have left in his word certain paſſages, of the letter of which innovators might make an abuſive interpretation; becauſe we find in this word texts the moſt clear and expreſs, by which we are referred to the Church: and the Church of all ages ſhews that the paſſages diſtorted by innovators are obſcure places, and ſuch as ought to be explained by others, which the ſame Church points out as plain and free from ambiguity. Thus according

to the Catholic opinion, notwithſtanding ſome paſſages apparently unfavorable to the true faith, our Lord has left an eaſy way to the knowledge of it. But as to the Proteſtants, to whom the whole viſible Church ſeems for ſeveral ages to have been corrupted with the moſt abominable errors, they can give no ſhadow of a reaſon, why our Lord foreſeeing theſe errors ſhould have given authority to ſo many texts, of which the direct tendency is to maintain the Church in what ſhe believes and teaches.

Q. Might not God, if it had pleaſed him, have cauſed the Scripture to be more clear and expreſs upon all the articles of faith, than we find it to be; and thus have ſubdued the oppoſition of the moſt prejudiced?

A. He might undoubtedly have ſubſtituted texts more evident upon all the articles of faith; but they would have been of no uſe to thoſe, who obſtinately adhere to their prejudices, and are without humility. To what purpoſe would it have ſerved, if our Lord, for inſtance, ſhould have explained himſelf in the four Goſpels after this manner: *I do not ſay unto you this is the figure of my body, but this is my body*: * that St. Luke ſhould have ſaid: *The angels ſupplicate and adore Jeſus upon the altar*: † that St. Paul ſhould have ſaid: *What appears to be bread in the Euchariſt is not really ſo, though it ſeems ſuch to the taſte, but it is the body of Jeſus Chriſt.* ‡ That St. Peter in anſwer to this objection of the firſt Chriſtians: *You teach that it is the body of Jeſus Chriſt, and our eyes tell us that it is bread*, ſhould have proved the truth of his doctrine by laying before them all the miraculous changes to be found in the New and Old Teſtament? § To what purpoſe would it have ſerved, had St. John ſaid: *Jeſus Chriſt, God and Man, whom we receive in our*

* S. I. Damaſc. de orthod. fid. l. 4. c. 4.
† S. Chryſ. de Sacerd. l. 3. et 6. ‡ S. Cyr. cat. myſt. 4.
§ S. Amb. l. de initiatis.

hearts, we receive alſo in our mouths, though it ſeems more horrible to eat a man than to kill him? * In a word, to what purpoſe would it have ſerved for all the ſacred writers of the New Teſtament to have ſaid over and over again: *that the bread is made the body of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, by the Holy Spirit deſcending on the Symbols,* † ſince the reformers are not agreed whether the Fathers who have actually uſed theſe expreſſions, believed the real preſence: whence it follows that they would have raiſed the ſame doubts, and cavilled in the ſame manner, if theſe very expreſſions had been employed by the Apoſtles themſelves? If the Proteſtants had that well-grounded humility, which our Lord requires in his Diſciples, they would find light enough upon all the myſteries, which the Holy Scripture contains, by means of the inſtructions of the Church, to which the ſame Scripture refers them. Thus much, and no more light has God given to holy writ, becauſe he would ſave only the humble, and alſo becauſe it is not in the power of words to controul the extravagancies of the human heart.

A. From whence does it proceed, that on ſo many points of doctrine, Proteſtants do not diſcern the light of the word of God which they read, nor that of the Church's authority, to which this word refers them?

A. We muſt form the ſame judgment of them, as St. Paul did, of ſo many perſons in his time, who read the books of Moſes, and ſaw the authority of the riſing Church, and yet were not perſuaded of the truth of the Chriſtian Religion. It was becauſe the veil of prejudice was caſt upon their hearts. ‡

Q. Ought we to hate them, and wiſh them harm, becauſe they diſlike thoſe, who quit them in order ſincerely to be reconciled to the Church, and becauſe they form unjuſt judgments of ſuch perſons?

---

* S. Aug. cont. adver. leg. l. 4. c. 9.
† Liturg. SS. Jac. Mar. Baſ. Chryſ. &c. ‡ 2 Cor. iii 15.

A. No, by no means; for we ought to bear them witneſs, that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. * If they knew the Church, which is the ſpouſe of the Lord of Glory, they would never ſpeak againſt her. † Beſides, our Lord has commanded us to *love our enemies, to do good to thoſe that hate us, and to pray for thoſe that calumniate us.* ‡

---

* Rom. x. 2. † 1 Cor. ii. 8. ‡ Matt. v. 44.

THE END.

